Publications Committee

34-706-1M

BULLETIN

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

NUMBER 78

The Inauguration of President Houston

[BEING THE UNIVERSITY RECORD, VOLUME VII, No. 1]

Published by the University of Texas semi-monthly. Entered as second class matter at the postoffice at Austin.

AUSTIN, TEXAS

JUNE 15, 1906

PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

BOARD OF EDITORS

The publications of the University of Texas are issued twice a month. For postal purposes they are numbered consecutively as Bulletins without regard to the arrangement in series. With the exception of the Special Numbers any Bulletin will be sent to citizens of Texas free on request. Communications in reference to exchange of publications should be addressed to the Librarian of the University.

344-706-1M

BULLETIN

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

NUMBER 78

The Inauguration of President Houston

[BEING THE UNIVERSITY RECORD, VOLUME VII, No. 1]

Published by the University of Texas semi-monthly. Entered as second class matter at the postoffice at Austin.

AUSTIN, TEXAS

JUNE 15, 1906

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. . . . It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge and the only security that freemen desire.

President Mirabeau B. Lamar.

The Inauguration of President Houston

(Being THE UNIVERSITY RECORD, Volume VII, Number 1.)

CONTENTS.

OFFICIAL PROGRAM 5

LIST OF DELEGATES AT THE INAUGURATION 9

MEETING OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS OF AFFILIATED SCHOOLS—

High-School Courses of Study ..... Superintendent J. W. Hopkins .. 10

The Honor System in Academies and High Schools ..... Superintendent P. H. Horn 15

Discussion of Supt. Horn's Paper .... Superintendent J. B. Hubbard .. 18

University Admission Requirements ... Professor M. B. Porter 22

University Admission Requirements: Subjects and Amounts ..... Dean S. E. Mezes 25

Discussion of Dean Mezes's Paper .... Superintendent A. N. McCallum 28

INSTALLATION EXERCISES—

Address ..... The Hon. S. W. T. Lanham 31

Alumni Address ..... The Hon. T. T. Connally 33

Address ..... Chancellor J. H. Kirkland 35

Address on Behalf of the Students ..... Mr. F. M. Ryburn 37

Address on Behalf of the Public Schools ..... The Hon. R. B. Cousins 39

Address on Behalf of the Faculties .... Professor G. P. Garrison 42

Address ..... President B. I. Wheeler 45

Address of Installation ..... The Hon. T. S. Henderson 55

Inaugural Address ..... President D. F. Houston 58

MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TEXAS COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES—

Moral Agencies in College Life ..... Professor W. J. Battle 83

Transfers and Credits ..... Dean S. L. Hornbeak 88

Can Colleges Enforce the Requirement that Each Student Shall Do a Full Day's Work Each Day? ..... Professor H. Y. Benedict 94

MEETING OF COUNTY SUPERINTENDENTS AND COUNTY JUDGES Superintendent Carl Hartman .. 99

OFFICIAL PROGRAM.

THE INAUGURATION OF DAVID FRANKLIN HOUSTON, LL. D., AS PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS. THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH DAYS OF APRIL, NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIX.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL THE EIGHTEENTH, 3:00 O'CLOCK, P. M., ROOM 74.
MEETING OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS OF AFFILIATED SCHOOLS.

Paper by Superintendent John W. Hopkins, Galveston—High School Courses of Study.

Discussion led by Principal Charles J. Lukin, San Antonio, and Superintendent J. W. Cantwell, Corsicana.

Paper by Superintendent P. W. Horn, Houston—The Honor System in Academies and High Schools.

Discussion led by Doctor W. B. Seeley, San Antonio, Superintendent J. B. Hubbard, Belton, and Professor George P. Garrison, The University of Texas

Paper by Professor M. B. Porter, The University of Texas—University Admission Requirements: Maximum Number of Units.

Discussion led by Superintendent V. M. Fulton, Cleburne.

Paper by Dean S. E. Mezes—University Admission Requirements: Subjects and Amounts.

Discussion led by Principal W. E. Darden, Waco, and Superintendent A. N. McCallum, Austin.

[President Houston presided. Principal Lukin, Superintendent Cantwell, Dr. Seeley, and Superintendent Fulton were unable to be present. In their absence Superintendent Arthur Lefevre and Professor Sutton discussed Superintendent Hopkins's paper; Professor W. T. Mather and Principal J. Morgan, Professor Porter's paper.]

WEDNESDAY, APRIL THE EIGHTEENTH, 8:45 O'CLOCK P. M., THE AUDITORIUM. PUBLIC MEETING OF PHI BETA KAPPA SOCIETY.

Annual address by James H. Kirkland, Ph. D., D. C. L., Chancellor of Vanderbilt University.

[The Rev. E. B. Wright, President of Texas Alpha Chapter, presided.]

THURSDAY, APRIL THE NINETEENTH. INSTALLATION EXERCISES.

Sidney E. Mezes, Ph. D., Dean of the Academic Faculty, presiding.

9:30 o'clock a. m.—Meeting of delegates and official guests in the Regents' room.

10:00 o'clock a. m.—Procession to the Auditorium.

West Procession—Chairman Henderson and Governor Lanham, Bishop Kinsolving and President Wheeler, Mr. Ryburn and Dr. Wright, the Regents and Ex-Regents, guests from Texas, State officials.

East Procession—President Houston and President MacLean, Professor Garrison and Chancellor Kirkland, Mr. Connally and Superintendent Cousins, the Deans, guests from without Texas, the Faculties.

Invocation by the Rt. Rev. George H. Kinsolving, D.D., S.T.D., Bishop of Texas.

Hymn by the Chorus and audience, standing. "O God, Our Help in Ages Past."

Address by the Hon. S. W. T. Lanham, Governor of Texas.

Alumni address by the Hon. Thomas T. Connally, LL. B., '98, Marlin.

Address by James H. Kirkland, Ph. D., D. C. L., Chancellor of Vanderbilt University.

Music by the University Band.

Address on behalf of the Students by Mr. Frank M. Ryburn, '08.

Address by George E. McLean, Ph. D., LL. D., President of the University of Iowa.

Address on behalf of the Public Schools by the Hon. R. B.

Cousins, B. A., State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Music by the University Band.

Address on behalf of the Faculties by George P. Garrison, Ph. D., Professor of History.

Address by Benjamin Ide Wheeler, Ph. D., LL. D., President of the University of California.

Music by the University Band.

Address of Installation by the Hon. Thomas S. Henderson, Chairman of the Board of Regents.

Inaugural address by the President of the University.

Hymn by the Chorus and the audience, standing. "My Country, 'Tis of Thee."

Benediction by the Reverend Edward B. Wright, M. A., D. D., pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Austin.

Music by the University Band.

THURSDAY, APRIL THE NINETEENTH, 3:00 O'CLOCK P. M., ROOM 74.

MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TEXAS COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Paper by Professor W. J. Battle, The University of Texas—Moral Agencies in College Life.

Discussion led by President S. P. Brooks, Baylor University, and President E. V. Zollars, Texas Christian University.

Paper by Dean S. L. Hornbeak, Trinity University—Transfers and Credits.

Discussion led by Regent R. S. Hyer, Southwestern University, and Professor W. S. Sutton, The University of Texas.

Paper by Dr. H. Y. Benedict, The University of Texas—Can Colleges Enforce the Requirement that each Student shall do a Full Day's Work each Day?

Discussion led by President H. H. Harrington, the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, and the Hon. Lewis Hancock, Austin.

[President Brooks presided. President Zollars, Regent Hyer, and President H. H. Harrington were not present. After the close of the discussion of Dr. Benedict's paper, President B. I. Wheeler addressed the meeting on the need of faith on the part of the teacher.]

THURSDAY, APRIL THE NINETEENTH, 8:30 TO 11:00 O'CLOCK P. M.
THE DRISKILL HOTEL.

Reception by the business men of Austin in honor of the President of the University, and the University's guests, Faculty, and officers.

Official guests are invited by the University Club to avail themselves of its privileges during their stay in Austin.

LIST OF DELEGATES AT THE INAUGURATION.

Austin College, President T. S. Clyce.
Western Reserve University, Dr. E. B. Wright.
Trinity University, Dean S. L. Hornbeak.
Baylor University, President S. P. Brooks.
Chicago University, Dean S. E. Mezes.
Northwestern University, Mr. P. L. Windsor.
Johns Hopkins University, Dr. E. E. Reid.
Stevens Institute of Technology, Professor R. H. Whitlock.
University of California, President Benjamin Ide Wheeler.
Vanderbilt University, Chancellor James H. Kirkland.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Professor F. E. Giesecke.
South Carolina College, President Benjamin Sloan.
University of Oklahoma, President S. P. Boyd.
University of Iowa, President George E. MacLean.
University of Wisconsin, Dean F. E. Turneaure.
University of Virginia, Professor Albert Lefevre.
Tulane University, Professor Ficklin.
University of Indiana, Dr. William L. Bray.
University of North Carolina, Dr. W. J. Battle.
Yale University, Mr. Alex. S. Cleveland.
Southwestern University, Regent R. S. Hyer.

MEETING OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS OF AFFILIATED SCHOOLS.

High School Courses of Study.

SUPERINTENDENT J. W. HOPKINS.

Something like three months ago Dean Mezes exacted a promise from me to appear on this occasion to read a paper on the High School Course of Study. A month later the aforesaid gentleman mildly requested me to submit a copy of my paper by April 1st in order that Messrs. Cantwell and Lukin might be thoroughly prepared to combat every part of my argument and overthrow all heresies I might seek to promulgate. The wily Dean indicated that the length of my paper should be eight minutes; the word eight was heavily underscored. Now, ladies and gentlemen, I do not like to prepare papers for occasions of this sort, and on themes such as the High School Course of Study. It is simply impossible to make a paper eloquent, and this theme demands eloquence of the highest order, for it is as dry as dust, and has been "threshed out" in teachers' meetings from Maine to Texas annually since the landing of Columbus. In casting about to determine what to do, I concluded simply to submit a statement of facts, then to "shoot these facts through" with a few of my heresies. Hence, about April 1st I sent Dean Mezes three copies of a sort of abstract or synopsis of what I might be expected to say on this occasion. This abstract or synopsis I shall endeavor, in the main, to follow, so that the gentlemen who are set up to knock me down may have an opportunity to uncork their long-bottled-up oratory.

In the beginning I should state that Texas schools are making phenomenal progress. Any speech or paper on this, or kindred subjects, would fall flat without this initial statement. This phenomenal development of the schools has in many instances brought about essential changes in course of study, methods of teaching, character of teachers, etc., so that I am reminded of the story of

the traveler in the West who saw on all sides evidences of remarkable stir and activity, and called out of the car window to a man standing on the platform: "Say, mister, you seem to have a good country here. Is it growing?" The stranger on the platform turned and pointed to a burro meekly standing nearby, and said: "Do you see that burro?" "Yes," answered the man on the train, "but what has that to do with my question?" "He was a jack rabbit last year," answered the man. Ladies and gentlemen, we have in the processes of educational evolution within a few years changed many of our schools from the jack rabbit to the burro stage. Whether this evolution will continue yet remains to be seen.

Students enter the high school with the arts of reading and writing, and some knowledge of arithmetic, geography, grammar, and the history of our country. They have spent from six to eight years on their elementary education, which is necessarily superficial, for they have been considering facts rather than principles. The mastery of principles distinguishes the work of the high school from that of the elementary school. The transition from elementary school to high school (and from high school to college) is not so sudden, so marked, a change as many people think. The reading of the elementary school becomes literature in the high school; grammar is continued, not as a language, but as the science of the language, and quite naturally becomes more or less comparative as other languages than English are studied; arithmetic is followed by algebra and geometry; history is continued in English history and general history; geography is succeeded by physical geography and biology. The generally accepted studies of the high school are such as they are, naturally, logically, and, therefore, wisely. They are: English, a foreign language, mathematics, history, and natural sciences. These studies are all practical. In them the end and aim of all education is sought, i. e., the "developed, strengthened, disciplined person regardless of the fate of the studies, or exercises, which are the means of the development." It is a mistake to suppose that we study mathematics, sciences, languages, history, etc., with any other end or aim seriously in view. It is true, as Mr. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education, says that "the school must give the student the knowledge of those instruments and conventionalities which make possible for him the acquisition of human learning by means of his own efforts." What Mr. Spencer

calls "complete living" is meaningless, unless coupled with the idea of development, strength, discipline, and power to do for one's self.

It is almost universally conceded that the high-school course of study should extend over a period of four years regardless of the length of the elementary school course. I shall be pardoned, I trust, for overstepping the limits of this paper in stating that it is my opinion that eight years is too long for the elementary course. If school boards will reduce the size of classes one half and employ better educated teachers, the work now requiring eight years can be accomplished in six. It is always better to do a few things well than many poorly. Both elementary and high schools need to have this emphasized. In the high school, it is wise to limit the student to a few studies, and to continue them, in the main, throughout the course. A good course of study is English, history, mathematics, Latin, physics, and chemistry; devoting one and one-half years to physics and the same time to chemistry; the history, mathematics, English, and Latin continuing unbroken for four years. Four recitations a day of forty-five minutes each are ample; more than four should not be permitted unless manual training and domestic science are taught. It is well to have these four courses of study alike for all students as far as possible. Certainly English, history, and mathematics hould be prescribed. If electives are offered, let them be offered only at the beginning of the second year. Require all first-year students to take Latin, if public sentiment will stand it; if it will not, create a sentiment for one year of Latin for all, then offer a choice of languages. This has been done in Galveston for sixteen years, with the result that over 75 per cent of the students take Latin four years. Besides, students who have had only one year of Latin do better work in a modern language. The study of Greek should be encouraged whenever conditions warrant the effort. The reason I stand for Latin and Greek and mathematics is that I believe there are no such instruments as these for developing, strengthening, and disciplining. That the student will not make use of these studies in after years is not a valid excuse for dropping them from the course, if they better serve the purposes of the school than other things. The "democracy of studies" is a delusion and a snare, if by this catch phrase is meant that all studies are equal in developing, strengthening, and disciplining.

If manual training and domestic science are in the course of study, require all boys to take drawing and shop work and all girls

sewing and cooking. Make this additional work, not elective, or optional work. Two hours' additional work a week of this character will not burden students. Bear in mind that manual training and domestic science are taught for their culture value, not to make carpenters and cooks. These studies are no more practical than mathematics and physics. They should not be offered as electives to afford an easy way for students out of difficult studies.

Unless sufficient apparatus is provided to teach properly the natural sciences, omit them. Physics, biology, and chemistry can not be properly, and, I believe, profitably taught without laboratories where each student performs the experiments and keeps a record of his work.

Have one course of study for the high school, and "keep this course open at the top," so that any student completing it may take the next step in his education. The high school is an important part of the educational ladder; it reaches from the elementary school to the university; its course of study should not "lead into byways."

The following course, which can be arranged to suit conditions in almost any community where a four-year high school is maintained, is recommended.

1st Year. 1. *English* (Grammar, Composition, Literature), 45 minutes daily.
*2. *Latin* (Beginners' Book), 45 minutes daily.
3. *Mathematics* (Algebra), 45 minutes daily.
4. *History* (Ancient), 45 minutes daily.

*If Latin be not offered, *Physiography*, 45 minutes daily.

2nd Year. 1. *English* (Grammar, Composition, Rhetoric, Literature), 45 minutes four times a week.
*2. *Latin* (Grammar, Composition, Cæsar), 45 minutes four times a week.
3. *Mathematics* (Algebra, review of Arithmetic), 45 minutes four times a week.
4. *History* (Mediæval), 45 minutes four times a week.
5. *Greek,* or *German,* or *French,* or *Spanish,* or *Physics,* 45 minutes four times a week.

*If Latin be not offered, a *Modern Language* must be substituted for it. The modern language substituted must be studied three years.

3rd Year. 1. *English* (Grammar, Composition, Rhetoric, Literature), 45 minutes four times a week.

*2. *Latin* (Grammar, Composition, Cicero), 45 minutes four times a week.

3. *Mathematics* (Geometry), 45 minutes four times a week.

4. *History* (Modern), 45 minutes four times a week.

5. *Continue* the subject elected in the Second Year. In case physics was elected, complete it the first term, then take up chemistry.

*If Latin was not offered in the Second Year, continue the modern language substituted for it.

4th Year. 1. *English* (Grammar, Composition, Rhetoric, Literature), 45 minutes four times a week.

*2. *Latin* (Grammar, Composition, Vergil), 45 minutes four times a week.

3. *Mathematics* (Solid Geometry, Trigonometry, Reviews), 45 minutes four times a week.

4. *History* (American), 45 minutes four times a week during first term; Civil Government in second term four times a week.

5. *Continue* subject elected in Second Year, unless it was physics; if physics, chemistry follows it from the middle of the Third Year.

*Continue modern language substituted for Latin in Second Year.

POSSIBLE COMBINATIONS OF ABOVE COURSE.

(1) English, History, Mathematics, Latin, Greek.

(2) English, History, Mathematics, Latin, Physics, Chemistry.

(3) English, History, Mathematics, Latin, German, or French, or Spanish.

(4) English, History, Mathematics, German, or French, or Spanish, Physics, Chemistry.

(5) English, History, Mathematics, two modern languages.

(6) English, History, Mathematics, a modern language, Physiography, Physics, Chemistry.

The Honor System in Academies and High Schools.

SUPERINTENDENT P. W. HORN.

In one of the April magazines Dr. Parkhurst has an article on "The Decadence of Positive Authority." The burden of his plaint is that there is coming to be in all quarters less and less of respect for positive authority. He is particularly sure that this is true of the school world. For instance, he says that a few years ago schools said to their students: "If you wish to come to us, you must study such and such things;" but that now the schools say: "If you will only come to us you may take your choice of so many optional courses that you may virtually study what you please." In general, he says that a few years ago faculties governed the student, but that today the students govern the faculty.

We school people of Texas must admit, upon reading this article, that we seem to be a little bit behind the times. We really did not know that things were quite as bad as the Doctor says they are. It is our impression that in Texas, at any rate, the faculties still govern the students—more or less. Rumor has it that even in the University of Texas there are some pretty well defined ideas as to which should be the governing body. In the colleges of the State and the high schools, the question has never even been seriously raised.

It is evident, however, even in Texas, that Dr. Parkhurst's article points out something of a growing tendency, even if not an established condition. Not only in schools, but in all departments in life is there less and less of tendency to accept arbitrary and unsupported authority. People have, today, less of awe in regard to the opinion of the minister, the doctor, the editor, the teacher, and even the prosecuting attorney than they formerly had.

They may at heart have just as much consideration for these men as they previously did; but they ask now to know on what their opinions are founded. It is not so much authority which they think little of, as it is unsupported and unjustified authority.

While all will doubtless agree in recognizing this drift in human affairs, there may be some difference in regard to approving or disapproving it. It seems, however, that this is only a corollary of the

fundamental proposition of democracy. At any rate, it is in the air and in the hearts of the people.

As a matter of fact, the rightness or wrongness of it doubtless depends upon the way in which it works itself out. If I am no longer to shape my course according to another man's command, the question arises as to how I am to shape it. If I shape it according to enlightened conscience and judgment, the change will be for the better. If I shape it according to mere caprice, it will undoubtedly be for the worse.

It is my opinion that these things apply to the young people in academies and high schools no less and probably not much more than to society in general. The same question arises with them as to what shall take the place of the decadent arbitrary authority. It goes without saying that it is far better for these young people to be guided by a properly developed sense of honor than it is for them to be cast adrift upon the waves of mere whimsical caprice.

There are, however, several observations which I feel to be especially applicable to the honor system as applied to these immature young people.

In the first place, it is an error to admit that the idea of authority is in itself unwholesome. As a matter of fact, the foundations of all government, whether of church, State, home, or school, must rest somewhere upon the idea of ultimate authority. The less mature the one governed, the greater the necessity for this idea. Human nature at best is "unco weak," and the less mature the human nature, the weaker it is. It is not safe even in the State to lose sight of the respect which men owe to legitimately constituted authority. Still less safe is it to do so in the school.

In the second place, however, it is unwise not to recognize the growing tendency pointed out in Dr. Parkhurst's article. We must recognize it and should not even wholly deplore it. The good government that really does come from within will endure. That which depends upon pressure will lapse as soon as the pressure is removed. The idea of a sense of honor within the pupil and that of a proper respect of legitimate authority outside should work in complete harmony, each reinforcing the other. Honor without authority, or authority without honor, would either be as much out of place in the school world as in the State.

In the third place, it should be recognized that the chief question involved in this whole discussion is not in the element of

honor, but in the element of high schools and academies. All thinking people know that a well developed sense of honor is one of the strongest inspirations to right living. The only question that arises is as to the extent to which this can be depended upon for the government of the immature young people in our high schools and academies.

As bearing on this last point, I submit several other considerations.

Any honor system in high schools and academies will fail if it does not take into consideration the difference between a boy's ideals of honor and those of a man. They are different, just as the ideals of honor held during the Middle Ages differ from those held by the world today. No honor system will succeed if it fails to make preparation for the emergency which will be sure to arise when the notion of honor in the student body differs from that of the faculty. It may just as well be conceded at the start that such differences will arise. Furthermore, they will arise on matters that are of vital interest to the welfare of the school. Such matters as cheating in examination are looked at from two very different standpoints when looked at from the standpoint of mature age and immature youth. Practices which both condemn will always be condemned much more severely on the one side than on the other.

Again, every honor system must make judicious enquiry into the question of the exact amount of strain which an undeveloped character may be expected to bear. It is alike injurious to put too much or too little of temptation into the young man's way. We all recognize the wisdom of the prayer, "Lead us not into temptation;" and yet on the other hand, we can see the point in Mark Twain's story when he draws the moral, "Lead us into temptation." It takes a certain amount of temptation to develop moral strength. It will not do to assume that our young people cannot measure up to a certain reasonable standard of moral strength; nor will it do to assume that any immature characters can withstand with certainty the greatest strain. Wise indeed is the governing body which can see that there shall be no temptation overtake them "which is greater than that they are able to bear."

Lastly, it is a mistake to assume that the honor system means the complete absence of a judicious system of watchfulness. It is not distrust which demands that the auditor of a company shall go over the books of the treasurer. It is to the treasurer's own interest

that this be done. No honest treasurer objects to the fact that his books are periodically inspected and audited. The most honorable men in these positions insist that these inspections be made carefully and frequently. They are as much to guard against the making of unintentional and almost unavoidable errors as they are for the purpose of guarding against fraud. The trustee of an estate who is anxious that no accountings be made for a long period of time is more likely to be the dishonest one than is he who insists on being checked up frequently. Railroads and banks and all large corporations check their men up frequently, and the employees who object to it are generally those who have occasion to object.

Caution never implies distrust. It is not distrust when the driver of a horse holds the reins firmly in his hand. If the driver allows the lines to dangle from the back of the horse which he believes to be gentle, and that horse, in some unexpected moment, takes affright and runs away, the driver is not the victim of misplaced confidence. He is merely the victim of his own folly, and as such deserves and usually receives scant sympathy.

The right kind of honor system in high schools and academies will make provision still for a judicious system of supervision. The honor system in high schools and academies is a good thing, so long as it supplements and is subordinate to a wholesome recognition of legitimately constituted authority. It is a bad thing wherever it supplants this.

Discussion of Superintendent Horn's Paper.

SUPERINTENDENT J. B. HUBBARD.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen: I am not at all sure that in my remarks I shall confine myself entirely to the admirable paper which I am to help discuss, but, as I understand that it is the question and not the paper which we are to consider, I presume that I am at liberty to digress somewhat.

I had read with a great deal of interest the article by Dr. Parkhurst on "The Decadence of Positive Authority," and I must say that I feel compelled to agree with the reverend gentleman in most of his conclusions. Unquestionably, we as a people are rapidly los-

ing the old-time reverence and respect for legitimate authority. As Mr. Horn says, "Not only in schools but in all departments of life is there less and less tendency to accept arbitrary and unsupported authority. People have today less regard for the opinion of the minister, the doctor, the editor, the teacher, and even the prosecuting attorney than they formerly had." Now, I think this is, on the whole, a bad state of affairs. It may be, as Mr. Horn thinks, only a corollary of the fundamental proposition of democracy, though I do not think so. But unless this condition of affairs can be laid at the door of the honor system, speculation as to its causes and an analysis of its various phases has no place in this discussion.

The honor system means self-government, and, of course, no such system unmodified can exist in any high school or academy, or college either for that matter. The idea of pupils or students doing the right thing of their own volition because it is the right thing to do is a very beautiful ideal, but like most ideals can only be approximately attained. In a very slightly modified form, it may be successfully applied in colleges, and in a very much modified form, it may exist in secondary schools. In some schools and in the hands of some teachers, it can be more nearly attained than in other schools and in the hands of other teachers. And, as Mr. Horn says, the more immature the pupil, the more is it true that supervision must be exercised over him,—supervision, I take it, over his conduct, his choice of studies, and the manner and method of his preparation of those studies. I think no one will dispute the truth of the general statement that the honor system in the abstract is a good thing, that self-government is the highest, noblest, most perfect form of government, if it can be made to work. But we must keep clearly in mind the fact that a government which works in the United States would be a complete failure in Brazil or Turkey, and that a system which can be successfully operated by adults will not work with immature children. As I have said above, the honor system must be slightly modified in colleges and universities; it will not stand alone even there surrounded by the broadening atmosphere of college life. The shadow of the "big stick" falls across the path of the student occasionally, warning him back into the straight and narrow way whose end is perfect peace. And in secondary schools, even in those where conditions are most favorable, the system requires many and vital changes before it can be put into successful operation. You may make the velvet glove as thick

and soft as you will, but the iron hand within must never weaken.

Pardon me for sounding a personal note, but I honestly believe we would do more toward solving educational problems if we school people would cut out of our proceedings at our various meetings, city, county, State, and national, a large amount of the usual high flown rhetoric and theoretic nonsense, and talk more about what we have done and are trying to do, each in his own particular little school. That is true, provided always that each of us is really trying to do something more than draw his salary and hold his job. Now for my own experience. For the past four years under almost ideal conditions we have been working toward the honor system in our high school. Our pupils, on the whole, are the best, most tractable, honorable, and faithful pupils I have ever seen. Our teachers have been young, enthusiastic college graduates, strongly in favor of the honor system. We have had practically the same teachers for several years. Our patrons are intelligent and conservative, and have given us their confidence and co-operation. Little by little we have given the pupils more and more liberty, removing one restriction after another, and studying carefully the effect of the same. Now, the result of our experiment may be summarized about as follows:

1. The honor system, in so far as it works, is a most excellent thing. 2. There are some matters in which it will work. 3. There are some matters wherein it will not work at all. 4. Some teachers can apply it much more successfully than others. 5. When to allow it to apply and when not to, is a delicate problem and requires for its solution much tact and ripe judgment.

Now, to take these conclusions up briefly in detail.

As to the honor system's being a good thing when it works, I will say that the usual comment from visiting school men is that we have more liberty and less license in our high school than most schools have. We do not harass our pupils with numerous petty regulations, and, as a result, they are not in a state of chronic if smothered rebellion. We trust them to do the right thing just as far as possible, and they usually do the right thing at the right time. Sometimes we have gone too far in this respect and have had to retrace our steps, but in the main our plan is to trust the pupils just as far as experience has shown that they can be trusted.

As to our second and third conclusions, allow me to cite some concrete examples, showing in what respects we have found that we

can or cannot trust our pupils. Among the rules in force when we went to Belton was the following, which I take from the printed regulations of the then current year: "Pupils are forbidden to throw rocks or other missiles at each other or otherwise, to run, scuffle, or loiter in the halls or around the buildings, or to make a boisterous noise in the school buildings." Now, I cannot imagine a boy without a concomitant projected missile. The two ideas are inseparable in my mind. And I find some difficulty in conjuring up a child outside the hospital, boy or girl, who does not run, scuffle, or make a boisterous noise occasionally. So we immediately repealed that statute, explaining to the pupils that they would be expected to do the right thing in the matter with their new liberty, and they have. A large number of window panes have been broken out by missiles, and in practically every case the pupil who did the damage has come up voluntarily and paid for it. Student sentiment is overwhelmingly against the pupil who would not do so. On the other hand, we have found that we cannot afford not to watch our pupils on examination. Our best, most trustworthy pupils say that while they are too proud to ask for help, still they would not hesitate to help a weaker pupil to pass if asked to do so. Manifestly, then, in the face of this sort of student sentiment, it would be a pedagogic crime to trust to the pupils' honor to prevent cheating. Now these are two examples of wherein the honor system will and will not work with us. I could multiply illustrations, but my time is limited, and I think these two are sufficient to exemplify my proposition.

As to our fourth and fifth conclusions, that some teachers can apply the system much more successfully than others, and that when and how far to apply the system demands rare skill and judgment, allow me to say that the success of any play of operation depends upon the good judgment and common sense of the one applying it. It seems to me that the crying need of the teacher's profession is common sense. We teachers do more fool things than any other people under the sun. I place common sense above scholarship in the list of essentials which make up a good teacher, because if one has it he will know that he cannot make a successful teacher without scholarship. Like Cato with his famous closing sentence, "Carthage must be destroyed," I feel tempted to close every talk I make to teachers on any subject, as I now close this paper, with this exhortation: Cultivate and use common sense.

University Admission Requirements.

PROFESSOR M. B. PORTER.

The questions that we have to consider in this paper concern the amount and, to a certain extent, the kind of preparation the colleges have a right to ask of the high schools, and here we may say at once that, since but a feeble per cent of the graduates of high schools go to institutions of higher learning, it seems strange that we could not logically require any diffenentiation of the high school curriculum looking to college entrance. The reasons for this are twofold: in the first place it is hard to see why a course of study which is a good preparation for the duties of life should not at the same time be a good preparation for the duties of the university; in the second place, it is not always possible for a young man or woman to determine during their high school preparation whether they will attend an institution for more advanced culture.

It is one of the best signs of the times when we are able to say that the day is going by when those who have to do with the education of our youths think it worth while to arrange courses for business men with stress on bookkeeping and commercial arithmetic. Business men soon saw—perhaps before some school men—that all such attempts to anticipate the practical training of a shop and office were nugatory and gave little valuable training of any sort.

While the fads of commercial education—the so-called useful knowledge theory—have been gradually relegated to the limbo of educational mistakes, the curriculum of high schools has profited by the inclusion of new and interesting subjects. This latter movement has, however, not brought with it an unmixed train af blessings. The introduction of these new subjects has brought new and in some cases as yet unsolved pedagogic problems. And it is a truism that needs no discussion here, that no discipline is worth while unless it is handled by teachers with an adequate preparation in that subject, and, in the case of an experienced science, unless costly apparatus and facilities for laboratory work are provided.

As matters now stand, the University makes a minimum requirement for entrance to the freshman class of three units in mathe-

matics (plane geometry and algebra), three units in English, and one and one-half units in general history. This is evidently a minimum in a very literal sense of the word, for clearly no graduate of a high school, whatever may be his plans for the future, should be given a training which does not involve these units.

In addition to these absolute requirements for entrance, additional units to the number of six (or five and one-half if Latin is included) may be presented at entrance, or if not so presented must be made up in the University.

It is clear that the freshman that presents the minimum number of units enters the University at a disadvantage, for if he hopes to graduate in four years he must do work for which he gets no degree credit, since beginners' courses merely absolve entrance requirements. Thus the effect of injecting into the University work that is looked upon as of high school rank, is to force the student to do extra work, and in the case of a modern language to compel him to begin at the age of sixteen or older a subject that should have been begun at a considerably earlier period.

Granting that all high-school graduates should present English, mathematics, and history, this question presents itself: Is it to the interest of these schools so to shape their schemes of study that every graduate would be able to present on entrance at the university a greater number of units? Would this involve a differentiation prejudicial to the main function of the high school as a place where young men and women are given their training for the varied duties of life?

While it is hazardous to enter upon the much-vexed question of educational values, I think that all, even partisans, will admit that the educational value of any subject is primarily conditioned on the facilities for teaching it, and that the effective handling of the subject requires two things, of which the most important is a good teacher, and the second a well-organized plan of instruction and carefully graded and arranged text-books and other apparatus.

Notwithstanding the great activities of text-book writers and pedagogues, I think it can fairly be said that the scheme of instruction of most of the newer subjects has not been brought to the degree of effectiveness that should be desired. It is partly for this reason that the training in English—one of the newer subjects, and of all the most important—is so ineffectual over the whole country. If on the other hand we consider the natural sciences, the situa-

tion is in some respects better and in some respects worse than in English. The teacher of a science aims primarily at imparting a knowledge of his science, and he always hopes to lead his pupils to see however dimly the significance of what is called the scientific theory, just as the teacher of English strives to develop in his pupils a style which if not elegant should at least be natural, clear, and grammatical.

In the high school in which three teachers must do all the teaching—and there are many such in Texas—the problem of how to get the best results with a slender equipment becomes most acute. All of these schools meet or try to meet the minimum requirements for entrance to the university, and it is pretty clear that with intensive work in other units they could more than meet these requirements. What we wish to consider at this meeting is the question whether this could not be done in such a manner as to strengthen the curricula of all our high schools. In this connection there are various possibilities. A school could, for example, present three additional units in a foreign language or in a science. The choice would depend upon the personnel of the teaching force. The result would be that the weaker units which cannot be used to absolve entrance requirements would be reduced to a very feeble percentage of the whole.

It seems to the writer that cultural courses so-called are of little use in the high school, because of the immaturity of the students and because such students need mainly instruction that will inculcate habits of industry and of voluntary attention. Indeed, it has always seemed to me that a misunderstanding of the Herbartian doctrine of interest has done our educational institutions much harm. For while it is certainly the duty of the teacher to make his subject as interesting as possible, he should at the same time deliberately give his students tasks that are hard and repellant, and where an effort of voluntary attention is necessary he should clothe them with the element of interest.

In conclusion, the question that I should like to call to your attention is the desirability of so arranging the work of our high schools as to offer a minimum of eleven entrance units, each unit at least a full year's work. Cannot this be done so as to strengthen in every way the programs of our high schools? Even limiting our attention to the three-teacher school, would not this be perfectly feasible and contribute to their greater efficiency? Several questions

must be discussed in this connection: the possibility of getting suitably equipped teachers and the ability of the schools to pay them, and finally popular sentiment concerning the inclusion of cultural courses in the high school.

University Admission Requirements: Subjects and Amounts.

DEAN S. E. MEZES.

It is proper that school and college authorities should take counsel together with reference to entrance requirements. Both are affected by the decision. Colleges desire to secure students prepared to profit by their training: schools desire to establish curricula as beneficial as possible to their pupils.

And it is well, in discussing the question, to bear in mind the fact that high-school pupils fall into two classes, whose interests may not appear entirely to coincide: the majority, who are receiving the highest preparation schools are to give them for life; the minority, who are being prepared for college. In establishing entrance requirements school men and college men should at the outset ask themselves what the real divergences of interest of the two classes are.

As the question frames itself in my mind, its answer depends upon the answer to the prior question as to the practical purpose of schooling, or rather of high-school training. If the purpose were trade training, for aptness in the technique of some mechanical or clerical pursuit, the divergence would indeed be great. But this is the purpose of the trade school, not of the high school. The latter has, I think, two aims: the imparting of information or knowledge, and the training of mind and character. And which of the two is more fundamental has never for any length of time been in doubt. Better than any knowledge is the trained mind's habit of making an intelligent search for information when it needs it—this is the hen that lays the golden egg—and of judging it sanely when it finds it. Without training, moreover, the small smatterings of information that can be secured in the school room are likely to make for conceit and to blind to the wealth of our ignorance. Information

is far from negligible; without it the trained mind and character miss their aims; but it is secondary to training.

And yet the thoughtful observer of recent educational tendencies soon discovers that the new learning, so bountifully supplied in modern times, has imperiled the rightful supremacy of training. With so goodly a supply of the many varieties of brand new information at hand, the temptation to give to each child at least a sample of each, has been too strong for our saner sense, and this is true in colleges even more than in schools. We have tended to chop up our curricula into morsels as various, as tempting, as frivolous, and as indigestible and dulling, in their combination, as the multiple courses of the old-fashioned dinner.

When training of mind and character is restored to its rightful primacy, divergence of aim practically disappears from the high-school course. The course that tends to give a mind edge, substance, and suppleness, and a character firmness, considerateness, and balance, will prepare quite as well for college as for life, and quite as well for life as for college.

With training of character and mind placed first, quality is ranked above quantity. Of first importance is the conduct of the school. This justifies the demand of many parents and trustees that a teacher shall be above all a good disciplinarian, provided always they do not accept instead a rigid and dulling martinet. Next comes from our point of view thoroughness, and, in general, quality in teaching. Better a three-years' course, with only four subjects—if economy requires it—taught by well-trained, adequately paid, and competent teachers, than inferior teaching and a curriculum richer in subjects and scope. And sustained development of a subject through the three or four years of the course is important also, leading the child's mind from the simple to the complex, and allowing it to broaden and deepen in the process, which it cannot do if subjects are dropped and others taken up every six months of every year. And finally comes the selection of subjects, in so far as different ones are unequal in training value.

Assuming twenty forty-five minute periods a week as the wise form for high schools, it becomes plain, I think, that three out of the four daily periods can best be devoted to English, mathematics, and a foreign language, each continuing throughout the three or four high-school years. With regard to English and mathematics, there is no difference of opinion, and I think there is as little doubt,

in case of the large majority of pupils, with regard to the propriety of a foreign language, so efficient a tool is a foreign language in broadening and otherwise training the mind, and so helpful to the study of English.

And personally, I am inclined to go further. Latin, I should say, disciplines the mind better than any modern language. Offering a great contrast with English, it is more broadening. Being the language of one of the two most remarkable peoples we know of, the English with its offshoots being the other, it embodies an especially helpful message. It is a tongue more virile and rugged than the Greek, with which it shares the quality of yielding training to the reasoning powers unexcelled even by mathematics. The processes of the rational mind, its supporting and substantial skeleton are crystalized and embodied in the grammar and syntax of Latin and Greek. The boy who thinks in terms of these forms is compelled to marshal his thoughts in rational relations to one another: he receives a high order of logical training, not in mere theory, but through the practice of rational thought.

The conclusion so far is, that in Texas at all events at least three units should be required in each of the subjects mentioned, with some encouragement to the study of Latin. I should like to see more than three units required in a foreign language, as it is reasonably plain that the average boy can begin a language more profitably in the sixth than in the eighth grade; but that is a matter for the future.

Coming to the fourth daily subject, all would agree that history should occupy something over a year: some of us would say that, in many cases, it should occupy as much as three years; for we are training citizens and they need the subject. If it occupy the minimum suggested, five hours a week for nearly two years are to be provided for, and can be taken up either with a second foreign language or with science work.

As there is room for a second foreign language, two units in a foreign language, restricted probably to Greek and modern languages, should be an alternative requirement to two units in science. And in view of the usual pressure to add more subjects than the teaching force should be asked to handle, and of the cost of equipping a science course, I am inclined to think that, in affiliating schools, the university should not recognize more than one science in any one school; at least for the present, till one science gets

well established in each school, the school having, however, the option of giving either a one or a two-year course. But on this point, as on all others, we should be glad to have the benefit of the experience and views of school men.

The requirements suggested would then read: three units each in English, mathematics, and a foreign language, with some advantage to Latin; one and one-half units in history, with two units in a second foreign language or in a science. This is a smaller total than most universities require, but it may be questioned whether raising the number of entrance credits has been wise; whether the amount suggested does not give an adequate preparation for college.

Discussion of Dean Mezes's Paper.

SUPERINTENDENT A. N. McCALLUM.

I agree with the paper just read by Dr. Mezes in the following particulars:

1. That college and school men should counsel together in regard to entrance requirements.

2. That there is a seeming though not real divergence of aim in high-school courses—the one prerequisite to college entrance, the other a preparation for life. This divergence does not actually exist when the aims of the high-school courses and the college courses are properly understood. The high-school course that best fits for college entrance certainly should best fit for life.

2. The true function of a high school is preparation for life, which includes the imparting of knowledge, and the development of character. This is also the function of the college—its aim is not mere scholarship, but culture; independent specialism belongs to the graduate school. From this point of view the college is but a continuation of the high school.

3. That there is a tendency to give pupils in both high schools and colleges superficial information by allowing too great freedom in choosing courses of study, and permitting too frequent changes.

The fault, however, is not with the system which permits elections, but it arises from lack of discriminating judgment on the

part of pupils to elect wisely, and from negligence on the part of those in authority in permitting abuses. The more wisely adjusted the courses in a high school properly equipped with teaching abilty and necessary apparatus, the better. Considerable latitude should be allowed pupils in selecting courses. Men are not made any longer by the "pouring in" process of indigestible stuff impossible to assimilate, and unsuitable to the needs of the life they are to live. They want those things that will fit present day needs, and the high-school curriculum should be made adjustable to the necessities of practical every-day life.

When courses of study are practical we find them adapted to the greatest number of pupils, and the service of the high school is thereby increased to the community which sustains it. The curriculum should be broadened, not contracted; and hedged about with care, there is no necessity for *scraps* of information. To furnish to the community trained minds, able either to enter the activities of life, or further pursue studies in colleges, should be the aim of every course of study. The high school no longer specifiçally "prepares" for college—it trains the mind, and the college accepts the trained mind in lieu of specific information in specific subjects.

Too much stress hitherto has been put upon the study of foreign languages—notably German and French as a "tool," and upon Latin and Greek for disciplinary purposes. These subjects in most colleges are no longer considered essential. I do not underestimate the disciplinary value of foreign languages, more especially Latin and Greek, and I believe a knowledge of Latin advantageous in any line of study, and first-class high schools should give courses in both. The practical question is: Can not equal mental discipline be secured along lines which prepare naturally for adult activities? I think so. Is there as much purely mental training—more "edge" and "suppleness" of mind to be got from a four-years sanely adjusted science course? To be specific: It is better for boys who are to enter any one of the university engineering courses to have a four-years science course reinforced by four years in manual training, than four years in Latin, two years in Greek, two in German, or one each in French or Spanish. I do not believe that the University should require a foreign language as a prerequisite for entrance.

The affiliated high school should have a strong four-years course with approximately the following requirements: Four units each

in English and mathematics; 3 units in history, including American history; 1 unit in civics, 4 units in Latin or 4 units in a science course roughly outlined as follows:

First Year, Physical Geography—Observations of nature, weather, etc.

Second Year, Physiology—Laboratory work in fermentation, bacteriology, combustion, ventilation.

Third Year, Chemistry or Biology—Strong introductory course, with regular laboratory and microscopic work.

Fourth Year, Physics or Biology—Laboratory work. In the Third and Fourth Years the schedule should provide for at least three daily recitations and two double laboratory periods a week. For the average high-school pupil who becomes the average university student I should give this course some advantage. In lieu of four years in Latin, give an optional course of two years in Greek, two in German, or one each in French and Spanish. University entrance requirements should be broadened in scope, not narrowed, and affiliation should be given to approved schools in as many sciences and as many languages as are properly taught.

I question the wisdom of high schools giving a two or three years course in one science to the neglect of other sciences. Strong arguments are made for this plan, and in some of the Northern high schools, many of which are virtually secondary technical schools, with instruction given in technique, this course is pursued. Two years in science under proper instruction, and with adequate laboratory equipment, brings the pupil almost to the point of graduate work and leaves the college little to do. It is too near an approach to specialism for secondary schools.

To close: The university should require the equivalent of a four-years high-school course broad enough to meet present demands and flexible enough for increasing demands. Too narrow affiliation to the subjects suggested in the paper, in my opinion, would be a serious misfortune. It would be a return, to a large extent, to the classicism of the past, and interfere with the continued progress of secondary schools.

INSTALLATION EXERCISES.

ADDRESS.

THE HON. S. W. T. LANHAM.

Dean Mezes: In the act of declaring herself an independent nation, Texas deliberately recorded her faith in the high mission of education in a democracy. The presence of the State's Chief Executive bears witness that that faith is vital today. I have the honor of presenting the Governor of Texas.

Governor Lanham:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen—It seems appropriate that the Governor of this great State of Texas should lend his official presence to this occasion. He can but feel the profoundest interest in all that concerns the well being, prosperity, and perpetuity of this splendid University which is doing so much for the cause of education in our commonwealth. I congratulate Texas, I congratulate the South, I congratulate the whole Union, upon the existence of The University of Texas. The conservation of this great institution concerns not only the execution of a cherished policy of the fathers and the desires of our people from the days of the Republic to this good year of our Lord, but the future growth, development, and progress of education and the dignity of our great State. If the time has not now arrived—and I think it has—it will soon be here, when the alumnus of The University of Texas will carry with him as high a certificate of proficiency as any *alma mater* throughout the Union can authorize.

It is an old saying and worthy of all acceptance that no great trust ever was created without finding a satisfactory trustee. When the lamented Prather so sadly departed from our midst, enjoying as he did the respect, confidence, and support of the people of the State, and when his obsequies had been completed, the public mind naturally looked for his successor. Soon the Board of Regents was

convened, and by natural selection, the choice was made of a man eminently suited and thoroughly qualified to receive upon his shoulders the mantle of his predecessor. I remember that when some of the gentlemen representing the Board of Regents conferred with me with regard to the Presidency of this great University, I suggested to them that it was important to choose a man who would require no introduction to the people of Texas. They made their choice, and in my judgment, they made it wisely and well, and I have no doubt that the one they chose has brought and will continue to bring with him all the equipment, all of the qualifications necessary to conduct successfully this great institution in all that concerns its well being and prosperity.

Will you permit me to say, ladies and gentlemen, that I claim a sort of proprietary interest in the gentleman who has been selected as President of the University? It is pardonable in me to say that I am a South Carolinian. I love the old State. Take the shell from its home on the shore, and it will always sing of the sea; take the fond heart from its home, and it will sing of its love to the ends of the earth. When I visited my old home in South Carolina I met a young and ambitious man who was then Superintendent of the public schools in Spartanburg.. I had been in Texas some years and was naturally enthused with the greatness of the State. It fell to my lot to give a description of Texas and to make some observations concerning its possibilities and the opportunities afforded here. This gentleman, then a young man, who with my friend Kirkland, also from South Carolina, could not now be classed among vernal poultry, listened *auris erectis;* his eyes flashed, and he saw before him the great field of opportunity which Texas offered. The next thing I knew he had wended his way to this magnificent commonwealth, and today he is President of The University of Texas. Truth is stranger than fiction. Little did I imagine then that one day Kirkland would be connected with one of the greatest institutions of the South, a learned man, with an education as liberal as our own and foreign schools could give him; little did I think then that I, as the gray-haired Governor of this State, would sit with Kirkland to assist in the inauguration of D. F. Houston as President of The University of Texas. If I had more time I would speak more about South Carolina, the dignity and glory of that State. I would tell you of jurists, statesmen, monumental men who came to Texas from her borders. We have present with us today

the President of the University of South Carolina, that institution which furnished the only teacher I ever had in the branches above the common school, Dr. Olin.

I endorse most cordially the words of our good bishop, who invoked divine blessing upon this institution and these men who have it in charge. O, that they may have wisdom to meet all the demands, every requirement for the great service in which they are engaged! May this University go on growing and to grow, flourishing and to flourish, prospering and to prosper. I wish for the new President the utmost success. I hope that each one connected with the institution will give to him his cordial support.

Alumni Address.

THE HON. T. T. CONNALLY.

Dean Mezes: More than by any other factor, the University is judged by its alumni, and is well content to have it so. The representative is the Hon. Thomas T. Connally, of the class of '98.

Mr. Connally:

Within these walls echoing with memories and made dear by past association, before this distinguished assemblage, and on an occasion marking the accomplishment wrought by our beloved institution and propitious for its future, it is with undisguised pride that I respond on behalf of the alumni to the sentiments aroused by the event that brings us here.

On September 15, 1883, in this building there was celebrated another inaugural, an inaugural which sent out upon the untried tide of fortune this institution, an inaugural which crystallized and brought into union the forces and influences, whose growth and accomplishments are the pride and glory of Texas. Struggling against great odds in the beginning, with acute enemies making insidious attacks from the cover and barricades of more popular interests, with a quiet dignity she has breasted the waves of adversity and has attained a success signalized by this occasion.

During all the years the dear mother with a benediction and

blessing upon her children and with a dower that can neither perish nor be dissipated, has sent them forth from her hallowed halls buoyant with the alluring promises of the future.

As to how they have measured up to her high hopes and motherly solicitude, the pulpit, and the class room, the study and the laboratory, the office and the counting room, the bar and the public service, give answer. How well they have paid their debt to the public is testified by the useful careers they have forged from their flinty surroundings. Some remain in Texas, others have migrated to other States; some reside in the far-off Philippines; while others have sought their fortunes in foreign lands and know naught of home save missives from across the seas.

But whatever and wherever they may be, they send greetings to the dear old University, greetings to the new President, congratulations and a fond and abiding confidence that all will be well in the promise of what this day assures us.

The day brings to each a sad, sweet homesickness, a desire to be back with the schoolmates of long ago, to partake once more of the rare delight of cutting class, to engage again in the fierce contests of college politics, again to quaff the tonic of sunshine and air on the athletic field in pursuit of the elusive pigskin.

Today Austin is the Mecca of their dreams: a longing like that of the faithful abides in every breast to make a pilgrimage here, to lay an offering at this shrine.

The University will always be to the alumni a source of continued culture and advancement, through frequent contact with its atmosphere of learning and scholarship; and the proper sphere of the alumni should be one that will strengthen and popularize among the masses of the people the institution that is theirs, to make them feel that it is not a thing apart from them and their interests, not an agency or institution of a class or clique, but that its welfare, its progress and its attainment to the highest degrees of scholarship are indissolubly interwoven and intertwined with the welfare and independence of themselves and their posterity.

These beneficent results can best be attained by the University man's exemplifying in every walk of life the highest and purest qualities of head and heart; by serving faithfully the people who honors him with places of trust and responsibility; by placing the common weal above selfish ends, and in permitting his patriotism to soar in the empyrean of an exalted purpose above and beyond the

base passions inspired by petty gain; by discharging in private life the debts of society with a culture and refinement that bespeak the democrat and yet the gentleman; and whether in public or private by meeting the problems that confront him with an intelligence and foresight worthy of the product of a great seat of learning.

With these great ends in view, with an executive of broad ideas and high attainment, the alumni are confident that the University from the years that stretch out before it in such abundant promise will carve a career commensurate with our truest ambitions and worthy of the hallowed and sacred traditions of the past.

Address.

CHANCELLOR J. H. KIRKLAND.

Dean Mezes: The people of Texas are largely of Southern extraction, and our University is bound by strong ties to her Southern sisters. The University is a State institution, but she is thoroughly aware of the noteworthy work of the many strong private and denominational universities, and rejoices in their steady progress. I take great pleasure in presenting a representative of these institutions, the Chancellor of Vanderbilt University, Dr. James H. Kirkland.

Chancellor Kirkland:

In the brief space of time allotted to me this morning it would be useless to attempt to make any real contribution to the serious thought of this hour. I would not undertake to teach a freshman anything in five minutes; for a sophomore, five days would be desirable; while for a senior, I should feel the need of five weeks. But before my golden moments shall have fled, suffer me at least to discharge my duty as a guest and express my appreciation of the honor conferred upon me by an invitation to participate in the exercises of this day. I bring to The University of Texas the good wishes and greetings of Southern institutions everywhere. The heart of the South is with you here on this occasion. Personally, I feel bound by the closest possible ties to this State and its educa-

tional work. The kind remarks of your chief executive remind me that a South Carolinian has a right to feel at home in this great State. Representing more particularly, as I do, the State of Tennessee, I am glad to remind you of the many ties that have bound that State to Texas from the times of David Crockett and Sam Houston even to this good hour.

To you, Mr. President, we bring today our assurance of confidence and good will. We congratulate you on the wide opportunity for service that is opening out before you. The robe of honor that now so becomingly clothes you is seamed with lead. When the applause of this occasion shall have died away and its flowers faded, there will still remain heavy burdens to be borne and important obligations to be discharged. We are sure, however, of your strength, and we have confidence in your wisdom, so that we fear neither failure nor faltering on your part. To labor constantly for the world with no thought of self, to find indifference and opposition where you ought to have active assistance, to meet criticism with patience and the open attacks of ignorance without resentment, to plead with others for their own good, to follow sleepless nights with days of incessant toil, to strive continuously without ever attaining—this it is to be a college president. But this is only half the truth. To be associated with ambitious youth and high-minded men, to live in an atmosphere charged with thoughts of the world's greatest thinkers, to dream of a golden age not in the past but in the future, to have the exalted privilege of striving to make that dream a reality, to build up great kingdoms of material conquest and make daily life richer and fuller, to spiritualize wealth and convert it into weal, to enrich personal character and elevate all human relationships, to leave the impress of one's life on a great and immortal institution—this, too, it is to be a college president.

May I venture to express the satisfaction of a visitor in the splendid achievements of this institution? We see around us on every side the proofs of intelligent and successful planning and execution. And yet I feel that in this hour our thoughts must be directed mainly toward the future. The South is in the midst of an advance movement. The dark days through which the older generation has been passing are drawing to a close; the greatness of our natural resources is recognized by the world; the desert is beginning to blossom with roses. On every mountain side great mines of un-

told wealth are being opened, by every flowing stream the sound of the mill wheel is heard, our fields are white with a larger harvest than ever before, and in every hamlet and every city are a thousand signs of progress. Fortunately, too, we recognize the intimate relation that must always exist between progress and education. We realize that of all our resources the most valuable and important are the youth of the land. Hence, we recognize that the educational question is the greatest question before us. Because of this fact we believe our material progress will be permanent and will tend to the improvement of our civilization. In the future of the South this great State will play a part of growing importance. No man can be a pessimist in Texas. The breath of the morning is upon you, and the spirit of a larger day strengthens your heart. It is only with the aid of the most vivid imagination that one would dare speak of the achievements of this State within the next hundred years. I can wish for this institution nothing better than that it should keep pace with and be the leader of your material prosperity. In the days to come your cities will be reckoned with the greatest of the South. Vessels from your seaports will be found in every harbor of the world. Your vast plains will furnish clothing for a nation, the raw material for a thousand mills. In that day we trust that this institution will be found still the promoter of your progress, the light of your civilization, the inspirer of the young men and the young women who shall then crowd its walls—the glory of the new Texas as it is the chief pride of today. To that end, Mr. President, we dedicate you on this happy and auspicious occasion.

Address on Behalf of the Students.

Mr. F. M. Ryburn.

Dean Mezes: The University exists mainly for the benefit of the ever passing generations of students, whose sincere spirit of co-operation it is a pleasure publicly to recognize. The students of today will be represented by the President of their association, Mr. Frank M. Ryburn.

Mr. Ryburn:

We have heard much today of the aims and ideals of a university. In a civilization so progressive as our own our higher institutions of learning must of course take the lead in the dissemination of knowledge. Here, if anywhere, should be found the sources of fresh thought and original investigation, and thinking people will always look to the university for the discovery of new truths and the propagation of new ideas., To investigate thoroughly and accurately, to consider justly and impartially, to proclaim frankly and fearlessly, should be the crowning purpose of such an institution, and until it has realized this ideal, it has not fulfilled its true mission.

Many factors enter into the constitution of a center of learning, and each has its influence in fixing the standard of the institution, but no element is more vital, no constituent more controlling, than the character of the men and women who compose the student body. Magnificent buildings, splendid libraries, excellent equipment, and liberal endowments, are of value only so far as they are made the instruments of intelligent and conscientious endeavor. Prudent management and capable instruction are necessary for complete success, but even they are powerless to promote their aims without the intelligent co-operation of those under their direction. The student must ever form the substantive factor in the organization. For him the university is established, and through him must its influence be perpetuated. Upon him rest the responsibilities of the present, within him lie the hopes and possibilities of the future. His is an important position, and if in his mental and moral capacities he can measure up to the standard of true manhood, the future welfare of the university is assured. Any human institution is precisely what human being make it, and since the university is in its broader conception the creature of the students, its claims for excellence must depend upon their breadth of mind and strength of character.

The true scholar is he who knows how and when to act, and is not afraid to execute his convictions; a man who is not content with the simple acquisition of knowledge, but who is ready and anxious to make it the common property of all. The cry of the century is for leadership. In political, social, and religious life public thought is no longer molded and guided by a few masterful minds and courageous hearts. We need leaders, men who are not

moved by every fitful gust of public opinion, but who, firm in their conception of the right, will stand by that belief until it ultimately prevails. The true leader does not gauge his conduct by the trend of public sentiment. Such a man is a demagogue, not a leader; a Cleon, not a Pericles; a Catiline, not a Cicero. A leader is he who perceives the truth, and glories in the knowledge of it, whose knowledge has become wisdom, whose wisdom has produced conviction, and whose conviction has become the mainspring of his action.

The student, then, should cultivate the qualities of leadership. No environment is more favorable to such development than that which is found at the university. The man of independent mind must be trained in an atmosphere of freedom. In his investigations he must find the truth unpolished and unalloyed, without the varnish of preconception, without the stain of bigoted prejudice. Freedom of thought and action is the very soul of the university. It prescribes no goal, it lays down no rigid rules of action, but it encourages the student to think and act independently and fearlessly, acknowledging no dictator but his own conscience, worshiping no idol but truth. In such an atmosphere the individual is taught to defy the mobs of passion and prejudice, yielding not to the tyranny of the majority, nor fearing the condemnation of public opinion. When this condition is fully realized, the university will have attained her higher ideals; her students will become leaders of men, molders of public opinion, exponents of truth, defenders of right.

Address on Behalf of the Public Schools.

THE HON. R. B. COUSINS.

Dean Mezes: There is constant touch and cordial co-operation between the schools and normal institutes and the State University, and those ties become stronger each year. The school system is represented by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Hon. R. B. Cousins.

Superintendent Cousins:

The State's educational purpose embraces the organization and maintenance of schools from the most elementary to a university of

the first class, together with technological and professional schools that shall both create and supply the demand for the complete education of the people.

The inspiration of this innate purpose, which is co-existent with the State, was expressed in the oft-repeated quotation from President Lamar of the Republic of Texas: "Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. * * * It is the only dictator that free men acknowledge and the only security that free men desire." The committee on education in the Congress of 1839, to which that part of the President's message concerning education was referred, responded generously, repeating and enlarging the President's recommendations in its report on the message. The committee argued for appropriating a large part of the public domain to educational purposes, for the establishing of free academies in convenient places, for the building of schools for the training of teachers, and for creating *one* university for the State, rather than *two,* as had been suggested and advocated. Perhaps this effort to establish two universities instead of one was the greatest danger to which The University of Texas was ever exposed. Its growth has been sure and steady from its beginning to this auspicious day. The public free schools passed their most critical stage in the constitutional convention of 1875, when for a time the very life of these schools seemed seriously endangered. Our independent district system, and the low limit of 20 cents for taxation in common-school districts with its requirement for two-thirds majority, represent at once the triumph and the scars brought from that memorable contest. Public education has taken an increasing grasp on the hearts of the people with the passing years.

The administration of Governor Elisha M. Pease, 1856-1860, is a red letter administration for the public free schools of the State, for during this administration $2,000,000 received from the Federal Government was set aside as a part of the permanent school fund. This act helped to decide, finally and forever, that Texas is irrevocably committed to the doctrine of the education of all the people, and the work was actually begun. To the administration of the "Old Alcalde" belongs the distinction of witnessing the accomplished fact of the beginning of the University.

Texas has it in her heart to place elementary instruction of good quality, for at least six months in the year, within reach of every child in the State, and to insist that he shall accept it; to put

secondary instruction within reach of every young man and young woman in Texas, which shall be correlated with the life and needs of the people, as well as with the University; to supply the common schools with teachers of training; and to furnish such technological instruction as will develop the inventive genius of the people, so that she may man and manage her manufacturing industries without the aid of imported knowledge or skill; to build a University of the highest rank, that shall exert a beneficent influence over the system. She purposes the establishing of better schools through improved teaching; by the consolidation of weak schools into stronger ones; through local taxation for better houses, longer terms, and better pay for better teaching; through the establishing of more schools for the training of teachers, and the better equipping of those in existence; through enlarging the scope and usefulness of the colleges of industrial arts; through adequate provisions for the University, thus enabling it to approach nearer and nearer the ideals of those who are charged with leadership in its development.

Great as her system of education is, Texas has failed as yet to provide the second step in the series. There is no free high school in reach of the boy in the rural district, although this school is undoubtedly contemplated in the Constitution of the State. The purpose to establish and maintain rural high schools is deep in the hearts of the people, and is working its way to its realization. Doubtless, within a few years, this link will be supplied and the chain will be complete, making a system of schools worthy of a great State.

The county should be brought into the scheme of education, to strengthen the weak schools and bring to pass the State's purpose to educate every child; and the rural high school will be the ward and pride of the county. The school organization will be compact and effective through graduation, correlation, close and intelligent supervision. Texas will offer "equal opportunities to all and special privileges of education to none"—the realized dream of the fathers.

We are in the beginning of really great things in Texas. People and politicians are looking with favor as never before upon the school man's efforts. The signs of the times point to an awakened public sentiment on educational questions, and to great things during the next few years through the development of old plans and

the devising of new ones. The purpose of the people is but partially revealed at present, but the outlines of a more perfect system are beginning to appear, with more and more distinctness.

In the studio of a sculptor there stands the half finished statue of a man of marvelous size, strength, and beauty. The figure appears to be eager to step out from the restraining marble. Month by month the fuller and deeper thought and meaning of the artist appear, as the resisting stone gives way under the patient, careful strokes of the artist's chisel. This is a picture of the slowly evolving purpose of Texas regarding her school system.

In the public library in Boston there is Sargent's masterpiece of art, called "The Prophets." Some of the figures are looking backward with satisfaction upon the pictured prophecies already fulfilled. Others appear dejected and discouraged. Three there are—Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi—looking hopefully to that larger part of the canvas yet untouched, where are to be painted the maturing miracles of Christ's dominion over the hearts of men. Accomplished facts in our school system prophesy yet greater achievements for the good of all the people of Texas, rich and poor alike. Prophets of righteousness look with enraptured gaze toward the picture yet to be drawn. They are they who recognize all the schools at once as the objectified will of the State of Texas, and who teach all men everywhere in Texas to say with emphasis, delight, and with a warm devotion, *our* common schools, *our* normal schools and technical schools, and *our University*. The schools are divided for the purpose of work, correlated and co-operative, but they are one in sentiment and purpose, and one in the hearts of the people. All the State schools send cordial greetings to the University this day, and to its new President.

Address on Behalf of the Faculties.

PROFESSOR GEORGE P. GARRISON.

Dean Mezes: United in sentiment and support, the Faculties extend their greetings to the President through the address of their senior professor, Dr. George P. Garrison.

Professor Garrison:

Like the youthful heir of an immense estate The University of Texas today looks out upon the future. Rich in money or in lands, according to the standard that has been set for universities in America, it cannot yet claim to be; but in the fostering good will of a State whose resources, already great, are increasing with almost unexampled rapidity it has a better and a more magnificent endowment. This constitutes the real permanent fund by the income from which the institution has been nourished to its present stature —a fund that, if I can read correctly the signs of the times, bids fair to increase until the splendid private foundations by which we now measure university wealth shall seem small in comparison. I need not dwell here upon the remarkable progress which this University has made during its brief existence hitherto, nor marshal figures in illustration. In view of such progress, it is not strange that cultured Easterners should attribute to The University of Texas, in common with all the Western Universities whose strength has grown faster than their traditions, the spirit of the educational parvenu. How far the imputation may be justified, I shall not stop to inquire. In any case it is certainly true that these young giants of the West are quivering with the energies that must dominate the twentieth century.

The most serious and impressive thought suggested by this occasion to all who have a place in the corporate life of the University is that of the opportunity, with its commensurate responsibility, which they share. What does it signify that by good fortune Texas was committed, from the very foundation of the Republic, to the principle of popular education, and that the public-school system with the University as an integral part has become an essential feature of the organization of the State? The system is, in fact, the mightiest civilizing agency that the State has ever set in operation. What, then, is to be said concerning the importance of the function of those who must control and direct its working? Are we to fear that they will unduly magnify their office? Nay, verily; the danger always is that they will think of it more lightly than they ought. It is well, therefore, that each of us should now examine himself with critical introspection and ascertain whether he has gone about the work of his life in the spirit of one having a mission which he fully appreciates and understands.

For yourself, Mr. President, on whom the heaviest burden falls,

and whose success or failure means so much more than that of any other among us, we have no fear. In taking the place of him whose loss afflicted us so sadly and whose memory we revere, you come to us no stranger. Out of intimate association with you during the years in which you were our colleague, we know your courage, your resolution, and your energy. We are aware also of your qualifications for leadership—your scholarship and broad sympathies, your knowledge of men, your firm grasp of both the general principles and the complex details of university organization; and now when, after a period of executive experience elsewhere, you return to us as our leader, we congratulate the people of Texas, and especially ourselves, upon the prospect.

Speaking, then, for the Faculty, I pledge you our loyal support and hearty co-operation in maturing and executing the plans that are to spring from your initiative. It shall be ours to teach, to investigate, and to assist, as occasion may demand, in the University administration; while to you we shall look for organization, supervision, proportion, and adjustment. We understand, I am sure, our duty to yourself, to our students, and to each other; and if I know the spirit which prevails among us, as indeed from long experience I ought to know it, we shall not acquit ourselves unworthily. It will be your function in part to distribute the rewards of our efforts. None can expect you to do all for himself or his subject that he might wish. Concerning this, you must take counsel not of us, but of "the Eternal Justice that pervades the Universe." Each of us has his eye, I trust, "upon the goal, not on the prize."

There are two considerations on which, for the few moments I have left to speak, I wish to dwell. The first is that of the University's relation to the State. This institution exists and grows because the people of Texas, who pay the bill, believe that it is worth every cent of what it costs. The average university professor is cosmopolitan by instinct and training, and he is sometimes led to forget the interests of his real employer. He does his work, and gets his salary, and there, as he too often sees it, the reciprocal obligation ends. Yet the best service is never given by the mere paid employee, but by him who is willing to make himself for the time a member of the family. This does not mean the setting up of any provincial standard. On the contrary, a faculty with the best interests of the University at heart will often find itself under the necessity of struggling against such a standard. But we should al-

ways remember that we are working for the people; and he that has no other aim than the selfish use of his opportunity for his individual interests is out of place among us.

Finally, without meaning to encroach on the presidential prerogative of offering a program for the conduct of the institution, I would venture to speak briefly of the true ideal of a university, as I believe this Faculty understands it. No university can fulfill its highest function if it does no more than to prepare its students for money making, or even for winning a livelihood. Undoubtedly it must give the most efficient professional training for engineering, law, medicine, and teaching; but most important of all is the preparation it gives for manhood and for citizenship. In spite of certain manifest tendencies in this age of vast accumulation of wealth and rapid material progress, it is as true now as it was nineteen hundred years ago that man lives not by bread alone. May The University of Texas never be subdued to the uses of the commercial spirit. May it be no mere factory of mental skill or culture controlled by captains of educational industry, where experts in the technique of instruction shall ply their trade. May it be rather a vestibule to the great hall of Everlasting Truth—an antechamber, where eager crowds shall gather to hear the echoes from within, and whence they shall go forth, with enthusiastic self-devotion, to carry freedom with richer and fuller life to all mankind.

Address.

President B. I. Wheeler.

Dean Mezes: The farthest west of American universities a number of years ago called to her presidency an eminent Eastern college professor, who in breadth of scholarship and sympathy fitly bears the message of the learned sisterhood of American universities. I have the pleasure of presenting President Benjamin Ide Wheeler.

In introducing the President of the University of California, I assure him that The University of Texas especially appreciates his presence with us in the stress of his anxiety, that its profound sympathy goes out to the people of California in the appalling calamity

that has visited their shores, and that it hopes most sincerely that the sister universities at Berkeley and Stanford have escaped serious damage.

President Wheeler, after acknowledging the greetings and expression of sympathy from Dean Mezes, spoke as follows:

A man who is just entering upon the presidency of a State university is for several reasons an object of interest, but not least for his hardihood in undertaking such an office. There is no more difficult and complicated task to which an American citizen can address himself. Let him combine all the energetic skill of a business man, all the intellectual subtlety of a scholar, all the commanding grace of a diplomat, all the persuasiveness of an orator, and all the magnetic force of a leader; he will yet find the demands of the position greater than he can meet.

The presidency of a privately governed institution such as the older universities of the East generally are, offers vastly less complications and difficulty; but even that is a peculiar office developed upon American soil to meet American needs. Two features of the American situation have conspired to make the presidency what it is in contrast to its prototype, the headship of an English college.

First, in the English college the ownership of the property and the administration of the finance was invested in the master and fellows, *i. e.,* in the teaching body—as well as the educational administration. There was no board of regents or trustees. This was evidently a continuance of the traditional organization characteristic of the monastic bodies, and no respect for such tradition came over with the colonists sufficient to commend a system by which teachers should administer and allot the moneys out of which they themselves were paid. There arose therefore the corporation or board of trustees by differentiation out of the composite functions of the old board of master and fellows, but the president maintained a place on both boards and sharing in both functions became the medium of intercourse between the two bodies and the buffer between what were often two diverse points of view, the academic and the businesslike.

Second, the Old World colleges were in a state of static condition of real or supposed adaptation to social needs and conditions with which they had grown up, and such is in large measure their condition today. In the new world the need of constant readaptation to newly forming conditions was keenly felt, and continued to be felt,

never more indeed than in the past twenty years. While experience has shown that faculty government is competent under static conditions, it has shown with equal clearness that for progress and readjustment strong executive leadership is essential.

At the demand of these two considerations the office of the American college president has come into being, half man of affairs, half scholar. The tradition of their origin in an ecclesiastical purpose has held many of the smaller colleges to the usage of selecting a clergyman to fill the office; the availability of clergymen with their better opportunity, as compared with teachers and investigators, for developing public and executive talents has often encouraged to continuance of this usage. Then, sometimes the pendulum has swung toward the business side and away from the scholar; just now it is swinging back toward the scholar and away from the "promoter." It is necessary in order to maintain the best spirit of scientific and literary work that the president should have sympathy with that work through personal experience with some branch of it. The ideal of the situation is fulfilled if he be regent-wards a man of affairs, and faculty-wards a scholar, and this is no easy combination to discover. Happy the president who can carry both rôles and yet not "wear two faces under one hat." If he fails to establish himself in either rôle, he is sure to be ground between the upper and nether millstone;—and he may be anyway.

To the difficulties of the ordinary presidency are added in the case of the State university all the complications which spring from the factor of public control. These have been so great and have proved so ominous in the eyes of prospective candidates that the State universities have in recent years found it difficult to fill the office. Indeed it must be said that the most serious obstacle in the present outlook of this type of university control associates itself with the apprehension lest these institutions should not be able to command for the direction of their affairs that calibre of talent and experience which their relative importance warrants and which can be commanded by the privately governed institutions. The tenure of office of State university presidents has been, for example, at least until the last decade, ominously insecure, and among the smaller institutions is still insecure. In fact only the University of Michigan, over which Dr. Angell has most worthily presided for thirty-four years, can offer an instance of the established length of tenure, though Dr. Northrop's excellent twenty-one years at Minne-

sota stand a good second hereto, and will doubtless be yet abundantly amplified.

Too often the position has been made the football of shifting popular moods of party politics, or worse of factional strife. Unless the university in all its working and being can rise, like a lighthouse, high and clean above the surging and dashing of the transient and the sordid, unless it can lay hold with its foundations upon something more solid than the shifting sands of opinion and prejudice, unless it can look down calm and undismayed in its anchorage of truth upon the battling waves around it, conscious that their fury cannot reach it, there might as well be no university. Its light will be no good. It will fail when needed most. It will deceive those who trust it.

I am warning here not alone about the common brew of party politics, but about the meaner brew that is stirred in the name of private pull: the influential citizen who wants his wife's cousin appointed to an instructorship; the editor who wages a grudge because a friend who was an incompetent instructor lost his place; the assemblyman whose brother's boy must not be expelled, lest appropriations in the next Legislature suffer; the professor whose salary had better be raised because it will be acceptable to certain important people with whom he goes camping in summer; the janitor who, though he toils not neither does he spin, is girt with the breastplate of membership in some order that must not be offended, or has rendered service in the primaries; the builder and contractor who skimps the mortar of cement, but is related to a prominent politician; the man who has always been a warm supporter of the university, and has shown this by sending three of his children to enjoy its free education, and who now feels that the professor of chemistry ought to find the right ingredients in the oil from his well; the man who wants a position to teach French, and though he cannot speak French himself, belongs to an influential family and had an uncle who once played the French horn. All this business is full of backhanded blackmail and backhanded stealing, but is tolerated and often promoted by otherwise well-intentioned citizens of sluggish public conscience, who dazedly conform to the vulgate notion that some way or other public money cannot be expected to have as much value as other money. A public official, whether president or regent of the university, or member of a school board, or mayor of a city, or Governor of a State, or keeper of the dog-pound, who

uses his position to secure public office and pay for a man inferior to the available best, because of personal and private relations or obligations to that man, has used public money wherewith to settle private accounts; he has treated a public trust as a private possession; he has stolen public money; he is a thief. The man who urges an official to do such a thing, has incited to theft, and is partaker in the crime. If there is any doubt about it, wherein does the doubt lie?

Among other difficulties, one has been alleged to inhere in the the position of a university under public control, which may in some circumstances constitute a real danger to academic liberty and the liberty of truth. This concerns the possibility that free investigation and frank instruction concerning subjects involved in the partisan contentions of those parties or societies into which the public is divided may be restrained or perverted through the influence of these organizations. A few pitiable cases have occurred in State universities, but immeasurably more in private institutions. In fact these latter are often organized in loyalty to some idea or set of beliefs, which very fact precludes the free scientific treatment of subjects having relation thereto. A State university should certainly lend no aid to partisanship of any kind, but on the other hand I have no hesitation in expressing my conviction that if the conditions of public control require that any field of human interest and social need which demands investigation for the social good must be excluded from the purview of the State university because of such control, then the basis of organization is false, and public control is a mistake. A university with blinders on is no university at all. But in actual experience I am pursuaded this difficulty does not in any real form exist. Scientific truth soundly determined and objectively stated in scientific form and spirit by real investigators who have been guided by their eyes rather than by their prejudices and who seek the truth and not confirmation of preconceived views is not the thing which awakens distrust and arouses protest. The formulations of ideas on which partisanship of every guise is usually organized seldom approach within solution distance of the real scientific formulations. Translation of one into the other must practically always be indirect.

The significance of the movement toward public control in connection with which has appeared the astonishing growth and de-

bringing the colleges into some better adaptation to the needs of society, and after these attempts had failed, as all attempts on the part of the State to delegate its work and duty in this regard seem likely in this country to fail, the impulse to an outright and direct assumption of the task gathered headway and gave us in 1819 the University of Virginia, an explicitly devised and cleanly planned foundation of the State, supported and controlled by the State for the direct good, first and foremost, of the State. Twenty-four years prior to that, indeed, the University of North Carolina, and in 1805 South Carolina College, had been established as State institutions. The needs of the great Northwest, which was now rapidly springing into being, arose to enforce the movement, and there soon followed the foundation of the University of Michigan and of the University of Indiana. Thence the type spread through the West and South, and later reacted upon the East. In no way, however, has this movement so surely betrayed the depth and range of its real power as in the change of spirit and attitude which during the latter part of the same period which saw the establishment of the earlier State universities overtook the older universities of the East. Though they still preserve the form of the close corporation or have at most admitted the election or nomination of some of their trustees from the body of the alumni, the larger ones among them have now come so fully to appreciate the essential responsibility to public sentiment and public needs, that in spite of the outward form of their government they may be said nevertheless in some very real sense to be public institutions and under public control.

Meantime the State universities, after passing through many tempestuous experiences of youth, are emerging from the period of experimentation and Quixotism, and are taking on some of the soberness and stability of their older counterparts. And it is well that they should. There are some great essentials postulated of a university, however its charter may read. Desirable as it is that a State university should be ever keenly sensitive to the conditions and needs of its community, it cannot be a university if it is swept about by every wind of doctrine, if it is overset by every wave of change. The university is the compass-needle, not the weathercock. The university, and particularly the State university, is under obligation to deal with knowledge in the living form of discovery. We mean by this that all its methods of teaching and study must tend to assume the type of independent research. The dogma,

the text-book, and the word of the master must yield to the free vision of the searcher and the brained judgment of the self-poised thinker. Dogma, text-book, and word of authority are all the glass in which men see darkly when it behooves them to see the truth face to face; they are all of them crutches upon which men hobble when it behooves them to stand erect on their own legs and grow strong. The slavery from which education seeks to free men is not only a blank slavery of ignorance, but slavery to the word of formal authority. Superstition is the horrible slavery of those who wear the fetter of formula, having in their hand no file to test its metal, whether it be softer than lead. A liberal education is and always was no other than an education that liberates a man out of the bondage of convention, recipe, and ruts, into the freedom of the sons of God. Memorizing the opinions of other men never made any man free, but discernment of the basis of opinion and the methods of their forming has placed in the hands of many a man the chilled steel that smites off chains.

A first and inevitable qualification of a university teacher is that he should at least once and somewhere have stood upon the picket line of the advance of human knowledge. One who has once stood there with the appreciated known behind him and the blank unknown before him, has been made thereby to differ from others as the Paul who had seen the vision of his Lord differed from the Saul who breathed out slaughterings. He is a converted man; he is one of the elect. He knows the frontier between knowledge and non-knowledge, where the one ends and the other begins, and hence how the paths lead to the next advance. Considerable difficulty has been experienced in finding an appropriate definition for a university in distinction from a college. I do not hesitate to find the basis for such a defintion in the predominance of "converted" men within the faculty.

Everyone who has ever been at a college knows well enough that the influences which have been a power in his life are but faintly associated with the recipes and knowledges he has adopted, but chiefly if not totally with the inspiration to see and judge and work for himself that he has received from living touch with the souls and lives of certain living men. After all the high mystery of the propagation of the intellectual life finds still, in spite all the pedagogies, its plain unfolding in the parable of the Shunammite's son. The real education is one of stimulus rather than dictation, and

results in opening the eyes more than filling the mind. The efficiency of university training will be measured on the whole in each case in terms of quality more than quantity, of intension more than extension. The zest and intensity of some part of the student's work will probably determine his pace for the use of his education in life. There is everywhere in our American universities, I am convinced, too much dawdling, too much toying with vaguely applicable subjects of study, too much use of the optimistic analogy between a university and a bureau drawer in which Bartlett pears are laid away to ripen, too much affiliation with that estimate of learning which values it in the class with robes and titles, nose rings and tattoo marks. There is too little appreciation of it in terms of hardness of fibre, strength of character, and rate of efficiency.

A good teacher in a university must fulfill two requirements. He must know his subject at first hand. He must have the sympathetic imagination to share the outlook of his pupil. Some of those who bear even in universities the title of good teachers are, I fear, only clever concocters of doses and preparers of capsules, things suited to be received by the normal human gullet without struggle or the excessive use of lubricants.

I cannot leave this topic entirely without venturing an expression of my opinion that in the recent high organization of graduated cirricula throughout our whole system of public education from the grades through the high schools, and the college to the professional graduate work, we have tended too much to lay foundations upon which houses are never built, and have encouaged students to take so long a start that they lose their breath before they come to the jump. To be creative in scientific or literary work a man must keep his imagination fresh. There is such a thing as "going stale" with too much study and too little doing. It may be that in order to set a broken bone conclusively a medic does not need to have reconstructed the osteology of a mastodon. But all this in a footnote by way of warning, not of doctrine.

A State university exists to set and maintain the standards of higher education in its State. It neither precludes the existence of other institutions, nor is it a ragged school. Local or denominational colleges will always exist and are to be welcomed as offering variety of opportunity, of discipline, or of influence suited to the varying instinct and interest of various elements of the com-

munity. It should be especially welcome if such colleges pay particular heed to the more direct personal oversight of students in the earlier years of a college course. The State university will, however, inevitably provide the standard forms of professional and graduate work, and will provide the standards and represent the general oversight of the whole body of higher education in the State. Of antagonism there can be no reasonable expectation; indeed contention would argue the relative weakness of the party contending, for there is evidently more work to do than all the colleges put together can compass. A situation, however, with which it might prove difficult for a community to deal would be created by the tendency to develop two State universities within a single State. Such a situation is surely impending in those States which have established an agricultural and mechanical college as distinct from the State university. There is no exact line of delimitation to be found between these in their inevitable growth. Duplication of work and conflict of interest before the Legislature is a sure result. But the State cannot wisely afford to be divided against itself, and consolidation, at least under one board of regents, is the solution that time and good wisdom and sweet reasonableness will certainly suggest. The State university represents the State, yea, *is* the State, in its attitude toward higher education. It expresses by its existence a clear public conviction that in free communities where universal suffrage prevails and the State is the possession of the whole people, education is primarily, and as a matter of plain self-protection, must needs always be the function of the State, *i. e.*, the State must be responsible to itself. Modern states are "progressive" states by virtue of enlightening and liberating education. Society which conceives of the present as only by and for the present is either savagery or a civilization launched upon the sordid ways of death. Society which conceives of the present only as part and parcel of the past is the stagnation of China. Society which conceives of the present as part of the future, looks upward, has the breadth of divine purpose in its nostrils, and we call it "progressive." When we provide for the training of the young, we do it in confidence that the duty of the present is not satisfied in caring for the present, but that the claims of generations yet to be must be heard in the courts of today.

The university's real commodity is light, not the pitch-sputtering torch of the agitator, nor the painted lamps of the bigot, but the

calm and steady light of well-determined truth. The plain, fair truth inspires no riots, provokes no panics, undermines no civil or commercial confidence, destroys no substantials of faith; it has no charm for the agitator or the sensationalist, being not crude enough for the former nor pungent enough for the latter; but the exaggeration and the half truth are more perversive than the lie.

The truth is harmless because it is the real. He who evades and suspects it proclaims thereby his doubt that there is a real. But there is a truth and there is a lie; there is a right and there is a wrong; somewhere in the moral universe of God there is a heaven and there is a hell; there is a light and there is a blackness of darkness; the university casts in its lot with the light.

Address of Installation.

THE HON. T. S. HENDERSON.

Dean Mezes: The Address of Installation, by the Chairman of the Board of Regents, the Hon. Thomas S. Henderson.

Chairman Henderson:

I am greatly pleased as the representative of the Board of Regents, to give official sanction to these inaugural exercises.

And in this connection it occurs to me that some reference to the circumstances of the creation of the office of President of the University may be of interest.

The original act of the 30th of March, 1881, establishing The University of Texas makes no provision for a President, and for fourteen years the Board of Regents, consisting of eight members appointed by the Governor, residing in different and remote parts of the State and engaged in various business pursuits, was charged with the administration of its affairs. Experience proved this extremely democratic plan to be unsuited to the demands of a great institution. Realizing this, the Regents urged the Twenty-fourth Legislature to grant them authority to elect a President, and as a result the law was amended by act of the 23rd of April, 1895, so as to allow this to be done.

This act does not attempt to define or prescribe the duties of the office, but in general terms provides for the election of a President, leaving his powers to be determined by the Board; and the Regents, while in no respect abdicating their authority or responsibility as the governing body, wisely decided to invest the office with the full and plenary powers which by custom and usage pertain to the chief executive officer of a university of the first class, subject alone to the supervision of the Board. For eleven years the University has been conducted in all its departments by a President, and its marvelous progress and development in this short period abundantly justify the policy pursued.

Three distinguished men have preceded him upon whom our hands are this day laid in this high position, and to their faithfulness are due in large measure the great results which have been attained here.

Dr. Leslie Waggener was chosen President *ad interim* and performed the duties of that office for more than a year with signal ability. He was an accomplished scholar and came to the University in its early life as professor of English. In addition to his professional duties he had served as chairman of the Faculty during the most trying period of its history. He possessed the entire confidence and love of every Regent and stood bravely at the helm, and his courage and vigilance piloted our ship safely through the dark night of peril. He was a noble Christian gentleman, to whom the people of Texas owe a lasting debt of gratitude.

Dr. George T. Winston was the first permanent President. At the time of his election he was President of the University of North Carolina, and was thoroughly trained in the work of university organization. He was a man of rare and brilliant mental gifts, and the four years of his administration form a most fruitful period in the development of the University. He breathed into it the true academic spirit. His was the master hand that deepened and broadened its foundations in every department, and upon his work will be erected its superstructure which will stand for all time.

His successor was William Lambdin Prather, a noble man who left us but as yesterday. He brought with him an equipment of incomparable value. He was richly endowed by nature, and a liberal education had strengthened and polished his character. From early youth he had lived in the State, and his soul was filled with love for its people. He had had large experience in business, and was emi-

nent in his profession. For twelve years he had been Regent of the University, and knew its wants and sympathized with its aspirations. These qualities enabled him to assume the office with a touch of authority. He surrendered all other connections, and, consecrating his life to its work, he determined to establish the University in the hearts of the people. He infused into its life the inspirations of the fatherland, and under his influence it was realized that this was indeed The University of Texas. President Winston had laid here the foundations of a great cosmopolitan University, and President Prather, without detracting from its strength, added the provincial or local quality so dear to the patriotic heart. Under his plastic hand its splendid superstructure was erected, and its noble architecture is neither Corinthian, Doric, nor Gothic, but is wholly Texan. He implanted in its soul the spirit of democracy, and opened wide its doors to the children of the people.

President Houston, I have spoken of the splendid and enduring work of your predecessors, not to hold them up as examples for your emulation, for your ideals are lofty and true and they are your inspiration to duty, but I have mentioned them rather that those whom you are here to serve, the people of Texas, may be reminded of the character of the high trust to which you are this day called.

This institution is very near to the hearts of the people of Texas. Their forefathers planted its seed in the perilous hour of revolution. President Lamar, speaking to the First Congress of the Republic on the 20th of December, 1838, said: "The present is a propitious moment to lay the foundations of a great moral and intellectual edifice, which will in after ages be hailed as the chief monument and blessing of Texas."

This seat of learning is the fruition of the hopes of the patriots of 1836. They reasoned with Jefferson, who, in writing to his friend George Ticknor in 1817 concerning the value of a university to the people of Virginia, said:

"Knowledge is power, knowledge is safety, knowledge is happiness."

They have declared that this shall be a perpetual fountain of universal knowledge; not a seat for any sect in religion, politics, or science, but a place where all the shackles that bind men's minds shall be broken and where all the truths of religion, of government, and of science shall forever find shelter. And its emblem

shall be, not the turning weather vane, but the unwavering mariner's needle.

Into your hands is now being committed the destiny of this commonwealth. The young men and women who come as pilgrims to this shrine will, in a few years, direct public affairs, the business and the social life of the State.

We feel that you understand the possibilities and that you are equal to the responsibilities of the great office to which you have been chosen. This goodly company, these educators, these distinguished visitors from other universities, these representatives of the colleges and the free schools of our State, this concourse of citizens are here to do honor to you and to give you encouragement in your great undertaking.

And now, speaking in the name of the Board of Regents and through them for the people of Texas, whose servants they are, I commit into your hands the office of President of The University of Texas, and their final word to you is "O, husbandman, look how white the harvest! Haste, haste to your work."

Inaugural Address.

PRESIDENT D. F. HOUSTON.

Dean Mezes: The Inaugural Address, by the President of the University, President Houston.

The University of Texas: Its Ideals and Problems.

FORESIGHT OF THE FATHERS OF THE REPUBLIC.

Most American commonwealths, like the Republic itself, were gloriously fortunate in having as their founders and early builders men of broad outlook and wise forethought. One who reviews the history of the founding of this imperial commonwealth will find

abundant evidence of the presence of men who, in high degree, possessed those qualities. It may be doubted whether a parallel can be furnished to the performance of the men of the Republic of Texas from 1836 to 1845.

When the independence of the Republic was proclaimed on March 2, 1836, seventy years ago, the white population of Texas did not exceed thirty thousand; and it was less than 100,000 when, nine years later, the State became a member of the Union. This population had too recently made its way into the territory to have made anything like a permanent habitation for itself or to have surrounded itself with the comforts of civilized life. It was scattered in groups in Eastern Texas, resting in the main on the lower parts of the leading water courses. It had to conquer nature and to contest for this stern privilege with hostile foes of two races, the one using the agencies of a despotic, hybrid civilization, the other the primitive weapons of savagery. And yet this handful of people, in less than ten years, laid the broad foundation of one of the most enlightened of the American commonwealths and enacted many enduring laws. With certain hand they drew the outlines of civil government, gave us the principles of our jurisprudence, fixed our system of pleading, adding to the stability of free institutions, by introducing into our system the principles of homestead exemption; and against the clamor of selfish interests, took a long look into the future and located the Capital of the State several hundred miles from the settlements, near the fastnesses of the savages; planned the endowment of our free-school system, and laid the foundations of this University, even designating the site upon which its buildings should be erected.

We are in no danger of unduly exalting the wise foresight of the men of the Republic; their performance is unique. Cultured activities are usually the last to receive attention. Every State, in the beginning, busies itself with fundamental questions of existence, and individualism dominates thought and action. No State founders have been more sorely beset by internal and external difficulties than were those of Texas; and yet they not only entertained high cultural ideals, but also found time to take effective action looking to their fulfillment. The credit for those things belongs exclusively to no one man, but special honor will, by general assent, be accorded here to Mirabeau B. Lamar. Some

of his contemporaries termed him a poet, a visionary, a political troubadour and crusader. It will take history a long while yet adequately to impress the truth that the dreamer, the far-seeing man, is the practical man in the larger affairs, of the world. Lamar dreamed a dream, of which our system of public education, including this University, is a partial realization. He embodied it in his annual message to the Congress of the Republic, December 26, 1838: "If," said he, "we desire to establish a republican government upon a broad and permanent basis, it will become our duty to adopt a comprehensive and well-regulated system of mental and moral culture. * * * It is admitted by all that cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy, and while guided and controlled by virtue, the noblest attribute of man. It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge, and the only security which freemen desire. * * * I feel fully assured that (it) this honorable Congress will, in that liberal spirit of improvement which pervades the social world, lose not the present auspicious opportunity to provide for literary institutions with a munificence commensurate with our future destiny. * * * The present is a propitious moment to lay the foundations of a great moral and intellectual edifice which will, in after ages, be hailed as the chief ornament and blessing of Texas." Truly, the historian of Texas is justified in asserting that, considering all the conditions, no finer appeal to the noblest aspirations of a people can be found. How the honorable Congress responded to this appeal and how following Congresses, Legislatures, and constitutional conventions persisted through storm and stress in the execution of these high purposes till our present scheme of education was in full and efficient operation is too familiar to this audience to justify repetition.

So, to-day, the sons and daughters of Texas are equal beneficiaries of a complex inheritance, an inheritance of liberal institutions and laws, of enormous natural resources, of generous endowments, and of high ideals and noble purposes. While fully appreciating the vastness and importance of our material inheritance, let us not fail to foster and increase the spiritual inheritance. It is the sacred duty of the young men and women, especially those of this University, and of the University itself, to perpetuate this inheritance of broad thinking and generous ideals, and to transmit it with large increase to succeeding generations.

THE IDEALS AND SERVICES OF THE REGENTS.

The men who established and organized The University of Texas and those who, as official representatives of the State, the Regents, have directed its policies, have been worthy successors of the men who conceived it and laid its foundations. Under the law the regents possess wide powers and assume heavy responsibilities. It has been possible for them, at any time, to pursue policies that would have wrecked the University and have produced educational chaos. The steady development and the acknowledged rank which the University has taken among the institutions of the Union furnish the best evidence of their conservatism, moderation, and enterprise, and of their clear recognition of their function. The most powerful members of the University, they have been the least conspicuous. They have displayed no pride of authority, no disdain of advice, or resentment of criticism. Although taxed by a variety of pressing business and professional demands, they have freely given their time without remuneration to the handling of the University's large and complicated affairs.

But they have done still more admirable and difficult things. Having clearly perceived that a university can not exist where the mind is not free, they have suffered no instructor or student to entertain a doubt as to his right and duty to seek the truth and to utter it; and they have sought to protect this freedom by carefully avoiding the selection of men who might mistake license for freedom, and offer wild vagaries for the reasoned conclusions of science. They have stood like a stone wall against all assaults of prejudice, narrowness, bigotry, and time-serving. Of the people, in close touch with them, they have seen to it that the University has ministered to the social and spiritual needs of the people, while preserving the universal and catholic spirit of learning. Believing that, if democracy stands for anything, it stands for merit and its recognition, and that democracy is entitled to the service of its best talent in public place, they have made merit the supreme test for fitness for position. These ideals also may be reckoned among the most precious assets of the University. Their firm establishment has been made possible by reason of the fact that the governing board has been a containing body with steady purposes and a spirit which irresistibly transmits itself. For this happy condition, credit will be gratefully ascribed to the Governors of Texas, the appointing power, and back of them, to the people, who have

realized that rapid change of management is incompatible with continuity of purpose and that political taint would work disaster.

THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY.

In view of this rare and inspiring struggle for the realization of cherished ideals, and in view of the certainty of overwhelming numbers seeking instruction here, it would be an offense to argue before this people the cause of higher education. There is no question of the desire or determination of the people of Texas to have here an institution that shall take a place in the front rank of American universities. A rare opportunity is presented for the execution of their purpose. The environment, physical as well as psychical, is unique. Fortunately situated in the midst of a phenomenally prosperous and rapidly increasing population, more than five hundred miles from any large and well-endowed institution of university rank, almost at the point of contact of two civilizations, at the head of an increasingly efficient system of public schools, cherished by an appreciative constituency, The University of Texas, one may confidently assert, in no spirit of boasting, will soon become one of the most considerable of the group of State universities, and will exert great power for good in a section of controlling influence. That this State itself will take a more and more conspicuous place in the councils of the nation is certain. The planning here, therefore, is of vast importance, not only to this State and this Southwestern section, but also to the Republic itself. It is with no less conception than this in mind that the regents, the faculty, and the student body must prosecute their high task.

UNIVERSITY PROBLEMS ENGAGING ATTENTION.

Although colleges and universities have existed in this country for centuries, and might be supposed to have settled most of the essential problems, it is a fact that never before have their aims, progress, and methods been so unsettled or have engaged so much of the attention of thinking people, and especially of those on the outside. For a long time matters of higher education in particular, were left almost exclusively to the college and university experts; but of late the layman, the patron, has become interested, and has subjected the system in all its parts to a searching scrutiny. Although many questions are still unanswered, much progress has been made.

Some problems have been settled here, at least, for many years; others are in process of settlement, and others have only just presented themselves by reason of rapid expansion.

CO-EDUCATION THE SETTLED POLICY.

It has been settled that this shall be a co-educational institution, open on equal terms to men and women in all its departments. Co-education is not accepted here because of "any false assumption of equality, identity, or similarity of abilities or attitudes" of men and women. The University recognizes differences, but believes that its life is sufficiently varied and plastic to enable it to respond to the needs of a student body of both sexes. The evils of co-education exist, for the most part, only in the imagination of the ignorant outside. It has not been demonstrated here that four years more of contact of men with women in college, which is the normal relation up to the college and after the college, destroys the masculinity of men, or the femininity of women. It might be discovered that it is not favorable to boorishness, and it will unquestionably be found to be antagonistic to vulgarity in all its manifestations. If the social life of co-educational institutions seems somewhat active, it should be remembered that it is conspicuous and easily observed; that neither the women nor the men spend as much time in social activities as their contemporaries in non-co-educational colleges. If the standards are lowered because of the presence of women, it may safely be asserted that the faculty is to blame, and not co-education. If many women specialists tend to the agamic or agenic, it remains to be shown that the explanation is not that women who, in any case, would have been permitted to be agamic or agenic, have found consolation in the realms of pure thought, or that they are the normal incidents of an increasingly complex civilization.

TECHNICAL PROBLEMS—QUALITATIVE STANDARDS.

Within the field of technical university problems, many vital questions are under debate in this institution, as in all others throughout the Union. It is not probable that the solution furnished by different institutions will be the same, but it seems likely that action will tend in the same direction. Such questions are involved as the standards for admission to colleges, the nature of

the requirements for the arts degree, the character and amount of work exacted of students, the conditions under which professional work may be undertaken, the relation of the college to the professional schools, and what higher education is worth while. These problems may be approached with quantitative or with qualitative standards in mind. Which of these the University will accept is in no doubt. It is keenly conscious of the truth that the dominance of quantitative standards has been the worst educational evil.

ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS—THE UNIVERSITY AND THE HIGH SCHOOLS.

It is clear that constant thought must be given to the amount and subjects of entrance requirements to the college, especially in a rapidly growing community. The University ought to require as much training as the average good high school can furnish, and it ought faithfully to enforce its advertised requirements. Both the amount and subjects of the requirements are matters of great consequence to the schools as well as to the University, and the exact terms at any time might well be the result of the mature and deliberate judgment of the faculty and of the ablest representatives of the schools. The University's welfare is bound up with that of the schools, and the schools are responsive to any intelligent and sympathetic suggestions of the University. Certain things are clear. The University should not duplicate the work of the average high school, for reasons of economy, if for no other, and it should strive to have students sent to it thoroughly disciplined in relatively few subjects rather than superficially acquainted with a great variety. Its scheme should permit wide election, but should demand thorough preparation in the subjects chosen.

THE SINGLE DEGREE.

The discussion of the requirements for the baccalaureate degree or degrees has centred about three questions: Shall there be one degree or several? Shall the course or courses be prescribed or elective? Shall the course be four years in length or less?

The University of Texas has decided that it will grant for undergraduate work only the A. B. degree. It has declined to discriminate among academic subjects as such for cultural purposes. It has placed the modern languages on a parity with the ancient,

and the sciences on a parity with the languages and the philosophical branches. Its only concern is that they be rightly taught.

THE ELECTIVE SYSTEM.

The unwillingness to discriminate among subjects as such, implies the acceptance of the principle of election by students of courses leading to the degree. That any other system could obtain in a real university, in a real university environment, is well-nigh unthinkable. The only question is whether the particular institution under consideration is of real university rank or not, and whether, therefore, it can operate on university principles. "Now as always," says Dr. Briggs, "the main questtion about the election system is when and where to begin it—how early a boy should be allowed to study what he likes rather than taught (if he can be taught) to like what he studies." For even the average American college or university, as between the prescribed curriculum and absolute freedom, the competent judge would scarcely hesitate to pronounce for the later. The rigid curriculum is a menace to individuality; it sacrifices the serious student to the trifling; it is not an ideal creation, but is a product of faculty log-rolling; it unduly protects professional incompetency and encourages complacency; and, what is not infrequently overlooked, it is inevitably composed of elementary courses, since each subject must find a place. Under its regime, the careless, lazy, and callow youth, about whom interest seems to centre, dawdled as successfully as under that of the elective system; and now, as then, the only thing to do with persistent dawdlers is to eliminate them from the academic fold.

Absolute freedom is the ideal, but the ideal is seldom attainable. Liberty regulated by law is a safe principle to observe in dealing with individuals or institutions imperfectly developed; and as yet no institution in America has confined itself exclusively to men of the requisite work, or confined its privileges exclusively to men of the requisite maturity and training. In imposing limitations, the facts in each case must be carefully considered. In most cases, faculties will continue to prescribe courses in the first years, to restrict the selection of others, and to provide some safeguards against scattering. Other measures might be adopted, which are, in no wise, inconsistent with the principle of election and are essential parts of any sane educational programme. Undoubtedly, many

of the evils commonly attributed to the elective system would disappear if a view simple precautions were taken.

NEED OF CAREFUL REVIEW OF COURSES.

With the breaking down of a rigid curriculum, the college schedule of courses has been enormously enriched. The growth has been rapid, and the courses in many schools reveal lack of careful planning, and the scheme, as a whole, shows crudeness and logical imperfections. It is clear that in many institutions courses have been offered in excess of the strength of the staff of instructors, the necessary demands of the student body, and financial capacity. Expansion, under the elective system, very quickly resolves itself into a financial question. There is need of a careful review of college programmes as a whole, and in all their parts. The points to be considered, especially, are the planning of strong introductory courses, the proper sequence of the more advanced courses found necessary, the sharper differentiation of advanced from elementary courses, bringing the more experienced instructors into fuller contact with less advanced students, and the elimination of superfluous courses. In many cases the pruning knife may be applied to the great relief of an overstrained budget.

SUGGESTIVE GROUPS AND HOURS.

Another step might be taken, to which the strongest advocates of the elective system could offer no objection. Suggestive groups of courses having in view the future careers of various classes of students could easily be planned and forced upon the attention of the newcomer. There are very few students who do not want advice, and fewer still who do not need it; and advisory committees can seldom do their work satisfactorily in the rush of business at the critical time. And it is quite remarkable how completely at sea even the expert is when he comes to advise the boy who has not made up his mind what he is going to do or who is simply going into business. Suggestive groups would, in all probability, decrease the number of the undecided, especially if they were worked out for those going into business. The main courses of such groups would certainly be indicated for the intending lawyer, doctor, or engineer. It is difficult to see why a university should have great difficulty in rendering similar services for the farmer and the cattleman, the journalist, the diplomat, the railroad ex-

pert. And in making up these suggestive groups for business men, no little emphasis should be laid upon certain properly conducted courses in law.

To round out the election system and to take full advantage of the opportunity which it presents, a careful scheme of honors for attainment in single subjects selected for specialization should be devised. It is the natural remedy for superficiality.

STUDENT SELF-GOVERNMENT.

An institution whose formal educational life is dominated by the spirit of liberty would not readily undertake to restrict unduly the freedom of students in matters of daily conduct and in the management of their varied social, athletic, and business interests. In the informal activities and interests of student life, there are immeasurable educational possibilities. Not a few clearheaded college graduates continue to testify that their most valuable training was received outside the class room and laboratory, in the daily contact of student life. Such training results only where the largest possible self-direction is permitted. As a people, we are committed to the principle of self-government. Our fundamental assumptions are a protest against the notion that any man or body of men may or can control our thinking or our acting, except when it becomes anti-social. The University accepts the correctness of this theory and confidently encourages its application. It is training men and women for service in a democracy; and it can not entertain the suggestion that they may be best fitted for a life of freedom by being kept in leading strings till the responsibilities of freedom are fully upon them. Competent observers will not debate the truth of the proposition that the best government is self-government. They are aware that it is, in fact, the only government.

The great leader of educational thought in this country asserts this with his customary frankness and scorn of pretence, with all the authority given him by more than half a century of experience with university life. "Fifteen hundred able-bodied young men living in buildings where doors stand open night and day, or in scattered lodging houses," he insists, "can not be mechanically protected from temptation at the University any more than at the homes from which they come. Their protection must be within them. They must find it in memory of home, in pure companion-

ship, in hard work, in intellectual ambition, religious sentiment, and moral purpose. A sense of freedom and responsibility reinforces these protecting influences, while the existence of a supervising authority claiming large powers, which it has no effective means of exercising, weakens them. The *in loco parentis* theory is an ancient fiction, which ought no longer to deceive anybody. No American college, wherever situated, possesses any method of discipline which avails for the suppression or exclusion of vice. The moral purpose of a university should be to train young men to self-control and self-reliance through liberty. It is not the business of a university to train men for those functions in which implicit obedience is of the first importance. On the contrary, it should train men for those occupations in which self-government, independence, and originating power are pre-eminently needed. A young man is much affected by the expectations which his elders entertain of him. If they expect him to behave like a child, his lingering childishness will oftener rule his actions; if they expect him to behave like a man, his incipient manhood will oftener assert itself. The pretended paternal or sham monastic regime of the common American college seems to me to bring out the childishness of the average student, as is evidenced by the pranks he plays, the secret societies in which he rejoices, and the barbarous and silly customs which he accepts and transmits."

THE UNIVERSITY AND CHARACTER TRAINING.

It need scarcely be explained that the University recognizes that there are temptations in student life; that it is not indifferent to matters of conduct or to character training. The University must train character; that is its highest aim and its chief duty. It will exalt character above learning, and the man above the scholar. The University does insist that there is no safe place for a boy of bad home training and evil tendencies, and that there is no safer place in the world for a manly boy than a college or university, because, in point of character, his associates are a select company, and because nowhere else are there so many uplifting influences. The dangers that surround a boy in universities are not peculiar products of university conditions. They exist because the University is in the world, in a community which is usually neither much better nor much worse than the hundreds of communities which the student body represents. It is well to look facts in the face.

No community has a monopoly of virtue. Every town, large or small, has its share of vicious influences and its quota of youthful criminals. There never has been a community where a boy could be shielded from temptation, and it does not seem to be part of the Divine plan that there should ever be in this world.

THE HOME AND CHARACTER TRAINING.

The truth of the matter is that universities everywhere have too long borne the accusation that they are responsible for the few character failures which ocur in them. Such failures would probably have occurred anyway, and are not unusually merely repetitions of former experiences. After all is said, it must be conceded that the college as a factor in shaping character is subordinate to the home. The home is the greatest character-moulding social institution. The race that has good homes will produce responsible citizens, even without the learning of the schools; the race that has unsatisfactory homes can not contribute responsible citizens, even though they be highly trained in the schools to satisfy the exacting educational requirements. Till it is realized that the home is the great school of morals and manners, and till the home is so universally regulated as to do its work efficiently, college circles will need protection against exceptional individuals more than the exceptional individual will need protection against the student body.

A FULL DAY'S WORK.

The students of this institution have demonstrated beyond question their capacity for self-government. In their activities they have displayed in high degree the requisite qualities of simple honesty, directness, frankness, reasonableness, and seriousness of purpose. The University owes a duty to this great element of the student body. It must say to the man who will not or can not work, or meet reasonable requirements, that he must seek a more congenial environment. No matter how perfect the academic system may be, whether it be one of liberty or restriction, the results will be unsatisfactory unless it is based upon an inflexible determination that all students shall each day do a full day's work. There is a growing protest among clear-headed men of affairs against the tolerance shown in many universities towards idleness and frivolity. It must be clearly realized that it is a serious thing for a man to spend in college three or four years of his life at a

critical period, and that whether he works or not and how he works, are more serious questions than what he studies. The institution that tolerates dawdling encourages intellectual apathy and vicious habits, and it will continue to furnish the practical opponent of a college training with his only potent argument. "The real fact," President Butler asserts, "is that the colleges and professional schools are too often not only wasting the time of their students and of many of the communities which support them, but they are doing a grievous injury to the youth committed to their care by encouraging them to dawdle on the pretence of affording them leisure to grow and think. The right use of leisure is an accomplishment reserved for the trained and cultivated mind. Adolescent youth has not much information on the subject, and not much capacity." The tolerance by institutions of weak and sometimes very unseemly performances of students is due doubtless to financial necessities, to excessive charity, to a false sense of justice to the student and to the parent, or simply to administrative incompetency arising from inadequate machinery. College authorities will not be on safe ground till they hold men in college to the same responsibility for prompt and efficient discharge of duty that is imposed on men in business. Institutions having large numbers of undergraduates just out of the high school owe it to the reputation of the large college to occupy no doubtful position on this point and to devise machinery to deal with the situation. They will need money to do it. They must provide more instructors and laboratories, so that students may be taught in smaller sections, and they must give the deans of the colleges adequate assistance. Until these things come to pass, we shall continue to have some inferior teaching, to employ inadequate methods, to secure unsatisfactory performance, and to have laments over the lack of contact between the student and instructor, and have comparisons instituted between the small and the large college to the disadvantage of the latter.

THE WORK OF PROFESSORS.

Universities, and, in fact, institutions of every grade have no greater responsibility than that of securing an adequate number of forceful and competent instructors and investigators. To many true friends of education, the number of instructors in any institution of higher learning seems excessive. They overlook the fact that in such an institution instruction must be offered in a number

of great departments: arts, law, medicine, education, and engineering; that some, or all of those have many schools, each with a variety of courses, both for graduates and undergraduates. They have little conception of the volume of work required of instructors in preparing lectures for advanced classes, in holding consultations, in assigning topics for investigation, in furnishing references, in reviewing daily written work, or formal examination papers, or in planning laboratory experiments. If the teaching is to be efficient, the sections must be small, especially in the freshman and sophomore classes and in all classes in language and science. The large section is the fatal weakness in the University no less than in the secondary school. But scarcely less burdensome, specially for those instructors who occupy seats in the faculty, are the varied administrative duties. In a great institution, publications must be edited, business enterprises be conducted on a considerable scale, religious exercises be encouraged, equipment be carefully selected and installed, faculty meetings be attended, athletics supervised, discipline administered, schools visited, public lectures prepared, and business correspondence handled.

But these things, by no reason, round out the sum of a university professor's responsibilities. Every professor worthy of the name must attempt to extend the bounds of knowledge; he has no more sacred function. His primary duty may be to teach. At any rate, in universities in this country for a long time to come, undergraduate work will and should occupy the greater part of the time of the majority of instructors, but instruction will be lacking in freshness and inspiration, if it does not proceed from a mind which has some of the "yearning in desire of old Ulysses:

> "To follow knowledge like a sinking star,
> Beyond the utmost bound of human thought."

RESEARCH WORK.

There are imperative practical reasons why the University should provide for research work. It is its duty to train men for positions on its own teaching staff and for the more highly developed high schools and colleges. No State lines will be drawn in selecting instructors, but it is obvious that the man who is acquainted with the environment has marked advantages. The University owes a duty to those already actively engaged in the professions.

If proper facilities are furnished, numbers of these will enroll themselves as opportunity offers. The inspiration which large numbers of such serious graduates give to undergraduates and instructors alike is of incalculable value.

Again, fruitful research work is of paramount importance to the State itself; historical, economical, and social records must be gathered, preserved, and interpreted. History must be written and must be written by the State's own sons and daughters. Perhaps no other section of the country to-day furnishes a better field for the historian than this Southwestern section. A section that has so rapidly made history of tremendous richness and significance, can not longer postpone the duty of writing it. Adequate provision for training historians to write our history is a vastly more efficient safeguard against misinterpretation than protests against inadequate alien productions, and is a duty the State owes to the memory of its makers. No less rich are the opportunities for research in economics, in law, in botany, in zoology, and allied subjects. Such work is expensive. It demands much of the time of men of the highest ability, who can be secured only with large rewards; and a community which balks at the expense betrays a willingness to sacrifice its highest interests and to practice false economy. Progress must be slow, but bold steps must be taken. Natural limitations will prevent waste. Not every man, even though he be highly trained, possesses capacity for fruitful research. Careful selection must be made, and funds be placed at the disposal of those who have the requisite instinct and initiative, especially if their work is in fields highly favored by the environment.

LENGTH OF COLLEGE COURSE.

While it has been the subject of much discussion in academic circles and the press, the length of the college course, considered by itself, vexes us here very little. This University has never required a period of four years for the acquisition of the baccalaureate degree. It has always had a system requiring twenty units or courses; and the capacity of the student has determined the time in which he could receive his degree. Here, again, the University has wisely avoided the quantitative test. A bright, well-prepared student may complete his course in three years, especially if he will utilize part of his very long vacation. Further emphasis might be thrown upon performance as against mere expenditure

of time, by advancing students of distinguished achievement a few points and by setting back those whose work is inferior. In no event should any action be taken which would make the A. B. degree stand for less attainment or acquired power than it does at present. Such a proposal has not been advanced by any considerable number of men of eminent standing. Time in college can be saved for serious students by such devices as have been suggested; and still larger saving could be made in the aggregate period of schooling, if more thought and money were invested in the secondary schools. Here the thief of time reaps his largest harvest.

THE COLLEGE AND THE PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS.

A more pressing and far-reaching problem confronts us in the relation of the college to the professional schools. In the judgment of competent experts the future of the college of arts depends upon the manner in which this problem is solved. The danger is that the college will disappear here as it has done in continental Europe, and that no equally satisfactory substitute will be provided. The college is between the upper and nether millstones, the professional school of low standards, and the aspiring secondary school. And the crushing-out process is most strenuously reinforced by the spirit of commercialism which demands large immediate results and takes little thought of the future.

Low admission requirements for professional schools and combined college and professional courses are the practical and definite expression of the protest against proper collegiate foundation. Say what you will, to count one year of professional work towards the A. B. degree for those who expect to take a professional degree is to reduce the requirements for the A. B. degree to that extent and to discredit the college course. As some one has said, it amounts practically to the publication of the fact to the professional undergraduate that the last college year is of no account to him and that he will get exactly the same degrees if he takes this year, or if he does not. The offering of two degrees for the completion of a combined course, shortened by the omission of a year of college work, is nothing more nor less than a bribe to the student to take more college work than he would take otherwise, and the only frank statement to make, as President Schurman intimates, is that it is a favor extended to students who stay in the University for six or seven years and has no intrinsic defense.

To admit students directly to the professional schools even more seriously discredits the college course. It is a serious tampering with standards and an unnecessary concession to a false sentiment. It evidences a willingness on the part of the University to place the seal of its approval on men whom it knows to be imperfectly educated, and proclaims its failure to recognize that one of its highest duties is to furnish democracy what it most needs, trained leaders of right ideals. What part of a college course should be required for admission to professional schools is a matter for most serious consideration, and prudence and justice would dictate that the advance to the proper point should be made by degrees after due notice has been given. While it might be conceded that a full undergraduate course is the proper foundation for specialization in law, medicine, education, or engineering, it is obvious that the requirements of a baccalaureate degree is not now practicable here, and will not be for many years.

JUNIOR STANDING FOR ADMISSION TO PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS.

From the active debate of this problem and from the interesting and varied experiments made over a series of years by great numbers of colleges and universities, at least one fact has begun to force its way to recognition, namely, that it is a substantial injustice and bad educational practice to deal with undergraduates of all classes on identical principles, and that, on the whole, the completion of the Sophomore year is a significant achievement. It, in reality, remarks the emergence of the student from the state of immaturity and incapacity for full self-control and self-direction to that ripeness of powers which genuine university work demands. It indicates the dividing line between the college and the university, and, therefore, the stage at which specialization for any career, whether academic, law, medical, engineering, or business may not unprofitably begin. How much further the student may prosecute the task of laying a broad foundation would be a matter for him to determine in view of all the circumstances affecting him, but to this point, at least, university ideals require that he be forced.

OBJECTIONS TO INCREASED REQUIREMENTS—THE GENIUS.

That the objections which every institution that has taken the forward step has had to overcome, will be strongly urged here against the proposal is perfectly certain. The unschooled genius

will play no little part in the debate. He has long been the chief asset of those who are prone to argue by comparisons and who can cite many instances of men of meagre preparation putting to shame their carefully trained classmates. President Eliot has cleverly disposed of this class of objectors. "I prefer the genius," says he, "the man of native power or will, the man whose judgment is sound and influence strong, though he can not read or write, the born inventor, orator, or poet. So do we all. Men have always reverenced prodigious inborn gifts, and always will. Indeed, barbarous men always say of the possessors of such gifts, 'These are not men; they are gods.' But we teachers, who carry on a system of popular education, which is by far the most complex and valuable invention of the nineteenth century, know that we have to do, not with the highly gifted units, but with the millions who are more or less capable of being cultivated by the long, patient, artificial training called education. For us and our system the genius is no standard, but the cultivated man is. To his stature we and many of our pupils may in time attain."

LOW LEGAL REQUIREMENTS.

Again, it will be urged that if university standards are raised, many will enter the professions directly, going entirely around the University. If it is a misfortune that the professions should be crowded by untrained men, the responsibility must be shouldered by those who frame the legal requirements. If the University allows its standards to approximate the political standard, it abdicates its position of intellectual leadership and must assume its share of the responsibilty for perpetuating a social evil. The issue is clear, and the duty of a university is plain. Through its products it must proclaim its ideals, and by them it must manifest its faith in theories, and prove them. Its alumni, by their performance, must make it plain to the public and to every individual who intelligently faces the problem of shaping his course, that prolonged systematic training is for the average man, the surest way to individual betterment and to social service. If they can not stand the test, then by all means let us frankly confess that our proposition is unsound, that colleges and universities are social ornaments, and have done with them.

THE COMMERCIAL IDEALS.

The objection frequently offered to advancing academic standards, that a decrease in numbers will result, even if it were tenable, is unworthy of notice. As a matter of fact, such a result is highly improbable. If one thing is clearly revealed by educational history, it is the truth that if an institution would increase its numbers, it must be careless of numbers; that if it concerns itself efficiently with its proper business of furnishing training of high quality, numbers will take care of themselves. It is certainly clear that the people of this State are much less concerned about the number of men who receive the seal of approval of colleges, than about their character and standards. From medical colleges, they expect, not quacks, but physicians; and from schools of law, not ward politicians and damage suit promoters, but jurists and statesmen. But the real issue will be whether or not a liberal training is a desirable and necessary preparation for the battle of life. Some practical business men will enter a general demurrer, even though they are careful to take no chances and are proudly watching the progress of their sons along the beaten path.

NARROW CONCEPTION OF WHAT THE PRACTICAL MAN IS.

Wholly or partially exploded theories in education, as in politics, will continue to exercise a very real influence, long after practice has ceased to be based on them. Undoubtedly, the commercial ideal which would educate men, not for living and not for social service, but for quick individual advantage, exercises a potent influence throughout the whole realm of education. The issue will be directly joined with those who cherish this ideal. There must be constant insistence that liberal training, in general, and liberal professional training, in particular, is enormously and peculiarly practical, as capable of being turned to use as the technical training of the blacksmith or the carpenter, or the mechanic or the farmer. Much confusion and harm have resulted from the tendency to direct attention solely to the unskilled laborer in discussions of production. Every class of men that has made for itself a permanent place in the economic system is an indispensable part of it, and is entitled to equal consideration with any other and to impartial treatment. The architect is as truly a productive laborer as the carpenter, and the teacher is no less than the architect. The lawyer and the judge who administer

justice, without which productive activity would cease; the skillful physician who keeps the human machine in good order; the business man who watches with wide vision the operation of industrial forces; and the statesman who co-ordinates the varied political and economic efforts of society, are immeasurably productive. Again, it is well to remember that the world's greatest practical contributions have issued from the brains of the systematically trained thinkers and investigators, the so-called theorists, whether in the field of science, or literature, or politics, or industry. What would be the state of society to-day without the results of the labors of Aristotle, and Plato, Demosthenes and Cicero, Bacon and Locke, Calvin and Luther, Faraday and Pasteur, Kelvin and Clarke, Maxwell and Darwin and Huxley.

PRACTICAL VALUE OF LIBERAL TRAINING.

Undoubtedly, the most useful equipment with which a man can approach any task is a mind trained to accurate observation and clear thinking, coupled with an inflexible will and a steadfast purpose. Industrial callings, no less than the so-called learned professions to-day, demand many-sided leaders. They must combine alertness of mind with breadth of vision, accurate and prompt judgment with infinite resource, and trustworthiness with adaptability, and these qualities will most readily be acquired through systematic liberal training. Says President Eliot: "The worthy fruit of academic culture is an open mind, trained to careful thinking, instructed in the methods of philosophic investigation, acquainted in a general way with the accumulated thought of past generations and penetrated with humility;" or again, he insists, "the educated man is not to be thought of as a weak, critical, fastidious creature, vain of a little exclusive information, or of an uncommon knack in Latin verse, or mathematical logic. He is to be a man of quick perceptions, of broad sympathies and wide affinities, responsible, but independent, self-reliant, but deferential, loving truth and candor, but also moderation and proportion, courageous, but gentle, not finished, but perfecting."

Clearly we must have systematic training of every grade for all classes of workers,—practical training, as all of it will be, if carefully planned to attain the ends in view. Better secondary schools for general training must be provided in every community, and they will be when parents realize more fully that education is the

best fortune they can bestow upon their children, and when communities really become serious about the matter. And special training in all the trades, in agriculture, in domestic science must be instituted after careful consideration along right lines. And it would be more satisfactory still if a varied modern trade discipline of universal application could be devised, after the fashion of the craft and trade guilds of earlier centuries.

Of all proper kinds and methods of education, the University will be considerate. To assist in inaugurating them on a sound basis and to foster them will be one of its highest missions. But it will not do its duty, if it fails to emphasize the truth that great advances along practical lines depend upon a foundation of broad and thorough liberal training, and that if the extreme advocate of practical training were to have his way, we should witness a fatal short-circuiting of our intellectual energy and the defeat of our larger and ultimate aims. President Wilson ably and pointedly defines the proper attitude of the University on this matter of technical or professional education in these words. "In the technical school, no less than in the colleges, it is becoming evident, not to the men of science only, but also to men who speak from a direct practical skill in practical processes, learned by precept and example in the laboratories and workshop of the training schools, that a liberal training is necessary for the equipment of men who are to take charge of the mechanical and chemical processes of our present industrial world. New processes must be found and used at every turn of the rapid movement of modern industry, and nothing but a very clear-cut and definite mastery of the principles of science, and of the more recondite principles at that, will supply them. Even old and familiar processes will go astray or stand unimproved in an age of improvement unless the men of skill be also men of broad theoretical knowledge in the sciences from which every process springs. Practical science gets all its sap and vitality from pure science; and the business of the college is plain. * * * Some men for lack of time or of means must hurry into their professional work without this first orientation in the general field of study; even the so-called learned professions must, no doubt, be crowded with men who are mere experts in a technical business, with no scientific knowledge of the principles they handle, and with no power, consequently, to lift their work to the levels of progress and origination; but some, fortunately, may ap-

proach their work more slowly, by a more thorough way of preparation, and it is in the interest of society that these be as many as possible. It is our deliberate purpose to minister to these men and not to those who skimp and hurry and go half-trained into their professions. And not to these only, but also to those who seek and may be induced to take the general training of character which is to be had by means of the contact and comradeships of a vital college life, the general training of mind and perfection of quality to be had from studies whose outlook is upon the broad field of all the world thinks and does." Again, he eloquently insists: "We have too ignorantly served the spirit of the age—have made no bold and sanguine attempt to instruct and lead it. Its call is for efficiency, but not for narrow purblind efficiency. Surely no other age ever had tasks which made so shrewdly for the testing of the general powers of the mind. No sort of knowledge, no sort of training of the perceptions and the faculties of the mind could come amiss to the modern man of affairs or the modern student. A general awakening of the faculties, and then a close and careful adaptation to some special task, is the programme of mere prudence for every man who would succeed."

TRAINING FOR INDIVIDUAL GAIN A VICIOUS STANDARD.

But there is a further and yet more important ideal that must find expression; mere training for making a living, for gain, is not a high or an ultimate aim, either for the community, or for the individual. Indeed, the notion that training is mainly for individual success in some pursuit is pernicious. It is unpatriotic and anti-social. It fosters the disposition of individuals to go into society for what they can get out of it. It generates a spirit of social exploitation and graft. It rests upon the false economic notion that the individual in seeking his own gain is necessarily led by the hand of Providence to further the common good. Current events sufficiently evidence the wide prevalence of this spirit in industry and politics.

EXAGGERATED IMPORTANCE ATTACHED TO PRODUCTION OF WEALTH.

The fundamental national defect is and has been for a century, the attaching of exaggerated importance to the mere production of wealth. This attitude finds its explanation partly in the condition of economic pessimism prevailing at the end of the eigh-

teenth century and partly in the industrial expansion of the nineteenth made possible by inventive genius and by access to the boundless resources of three continents. The truth of the matter is that the great problems which vex the world now are not problems of production of wealth, but the vastly more complex and fateful problem of its distribution, utilization, and control. The central problem is how, while continuing to increase individual efficiency, to direct individual prowess to the promotion of social welfare and well-being.

PERPETUITY OF OUR INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED.

The perpetuity of our institutions themselves is involved in the solution of these problems. It is obvious that the central government's sphere will rapidly expand in its efforts to cope with industrial forces steadily and rapidly increasing in strength, range, and complexity. It is yet a question whether without limitations, it could maintain its supremacy over the unified strength of the most tremendous financial organizations the world has ever known and subject them indisputably to the supreme rule of law.

POSITION OF STATES DEPENDENT ON EFFICIENCY OF GOVERNMENTS.

The part the States will play in this struggle, and the place they will occupy when the issues are settled are matters of grave concern. Will they sink to the position of insignificance and impotence that local units in all other nations have come to occupy? Or will they rise to a true conception of their function and, replacing protest against loss of prestige by sturdy efficiency in dealing with affairs reserved for their direction, preserve their integrity and mightily reinforce the efforts of the common agent? Supreme efficiency alone will guarantee their preservation. Jefferson, seer that he was, keenly perceived this, as he did other vital truths, pointing out that a wise government was the only safeguard.

TRAINING FOR SOCIAL SERVICE THE MOST URGENT NEED.

The training of the schools, therefore, must be directed to something more than the moulding of experts in the trades and in the professions, and must have other objects in view besides the in-

crease of wealth and its proper utilization. They must consciously and definitely train for moral efficiency and for social service. The greatest practical need of democracy to-day is an adequate number of men of simple honesty, inflexible will and intelligence, "who are not to be great, but as they save or serve the State." To this end, the University, while fostering the sciences and the arts, must lay peculiar emphasis upon those branches which make directly for efficient citizenship. Literature, history, ethics and philosophy and economics, government and law, should be liberally provided for, and every student should be urged to include them in his programme of studies. Because education is fostered by democracy for its preservation and perpetuation, and because the people of our section in particular have shown such aptitude for unselfish political leadership, and because of the great part that this State is destined to play in shaping the policy of the Union, the building up here of a great school of the science of government and economics is a plain duty. And so this University, while it will labor diligently to serve all the commonly recognized practical needs of the State, by training men and women for the schools and men for business, for banking and transportation, for engineering and law and medicine, will strive even more valiantly to satisfy the more pressing need of the State by training sane, unselfish, persistently active citizens who will recognize their obligations and will discharge them. It accepts the notion of Jefferson and every other champion of democracy that a primary duty of a university is "to form statesmen, legislators and judges on whom public prosperity and individual happiness are so much to depend; and it gladly heeds the implied injunction of its founders that it shall be a means whereby the attachment of the young men of the State to the interests, the institutions, the rights of the State and the liberties of the people," may "be encouraged and increased." Finally, it will hold fast to the noble sentiment that, while "poetry and philosophy and science do indeed conspire to promote the material welfare of mankind," "science no more than poetry finds it best warrant in utility;" that "truth and right are above utility in all realms of thought and action;" that true education must begin and continue with a fine disregard to pecuniary returns; "that it must be catholic, genial, disinterested;" that "its object is to make the shoemaker go beyond his last, and the clerk beyond his desk, and the surveyor beyond his chain, and

the lawyer beyond his brief, and the doctor beyond his prescription, and the preacher beyond his sermon."

PLEDGE OF CO-OPERATION.

Cherishing such ideals, gathering inspiration from the presence and words of strong friends from institutions within and without the State, The University of Texas will move forward with high confidence that an appreciative people will liberally endow, support, and maintain it, so that it may train with increasing efficiency the thousands of young men and women of Texas who will crowd its halls. To each individual in the vast army of educational servants, wherever he may be placed, and to each institution, public or private, secular or denominational, engaged in the noble task of "drilling the raw world for the march of mind, the University sends its proffer of assistance and its pledge of co-operation. To the alumni, its legitimate extension workers, wherever they may be engaged in the world's work, the University sends her greetings and expresses its conviction that through them her ideals are finding efficient practical realization.

MEETING OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TEXAS COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Moral Agencies in College Life.

PROFESSOR W. J. BATTLE.

It is a commonplace nowadays that education is the development of power. The ideal education aims at the making of a strong body, a strong mind, a noble soul. The development of mental power is the first concern of our existing educational system. The training of the body is now generally admitted to be a function of schools of all grades. The third or spiritual side of education, however, seems to me not properly emphasized or even fully understood. The question is not one of religious teaching merely. Let us take up the chief factors in college life that, apart from the discipline intended primarily for the mind and the body, contribute to the formation of character—the moral agencies, that is to say, of our subject.

One thinks of religious influences first. It is clear at the outset that though colleges under private control may and do offer direct religious instruction, in State institutions there can be none. It is contrary to our fundamental law separating church and State. But ours is a Christian community, and even State universities encourage religion, indeed the Christian religion, in many ways. They make provision for morning prayers; for graduating sermons; for prayer and reading of the Bible, and hymns on solemn occasions. They insist that all officers shall be, if not professing Christians, at least in sympathy with Christian ideals. They offer hospitality to sundry voluntary associations for the advancement of religion. Further, at some State institutions, as at nearly all under private control, there is also a chapel, a building devoted primarily to divine worship. In all this the institution stands, in my judgment, on firm ground. The recognition thereby implied of a power higher than ourselves involves no establishment of religion, but tells the world that, putting aside distinctions of creed,

the institution is a unit in striving for the righteousness which alone exalteth a nation.

This indirect work by the institution itself is everywhere supplemented by private effort. The work of the several churches in college towns is sure to be aimed specially at college students. Here and there the churches have erected special halls as homes for their members in the university. In other places professorships have been established for the teaching of the Bible. Agencies like these deserve full commendation. Under judicious management they can do an incalculable service not only to the church that establishes them but to the cause of religion in general. It is surprising that their possibilities are not more generally recognized. Universities and colleges are strategic points. There are gathered the best of the country's young manhood and womanhood. In them are the leaders of the coming generation, the men and women who will fix the tone of the community's life. In them, if anywhere, the churches should put forth their strongest efforts. There they should send their ablest men, there erect their noblest buildings.

Next to the work of the several churches comes that of the special societies formed for the promotion of religious ends. The Christian associations have been on the whole successful in their work. In the main it is manly and womanly and free from cant, and being of students for students it has a spontaneity and directness not always to be found in the efforts of the churches. The interest in the study of the Bible and the enthusiasm for missions developed in recent years are among the most notable phenomena of our selfish yet altruistic age.

Coming now to the indirect moral agencies of our college life, I fancy some might question whether they are not more powerful than those professedly religious.

First among them I would put athletics. I do not mean gymnastic training, but athletic contests—foot-ball, base-ball, and the rest. The subject is a broad one, and I am not a specialist, but I must express my conviction that with a large class of students there is no influence in college life so strong towards clean living as athletic games. The courage, the energy, the persistence, the self-control, required for success in these games are of a high type, and the popular enthusiasm for sport and admiration for athletic prowess which makes athletics the heroes of the institution makes also their lives and characters standards for others to imitate. A

friend of mine who has had the best of opportunities to judge, assures me that at the University of North Carolina, for example, the whole tone of student life is now incalculably higher than it was before the institution of systematic athletic games. The players themselves were forced to adopt clean lives in order to play at all, and the influence of their example spread through the whole University.

When I speak of athletic games I mean inter-collegiate games. It is clear, I think, that contests within a single institution do not give the necessary incentive. I wish they did. Here in Texas we labor under the disadvantage of great distance from the more famous institutions of the country. Our policy, it seems to me, should be to recognize this fact and to develop intra-state games to the point of real rivalry. I wish that the colleges of Texas might all share my views and enter with heart and soul into athletic sports. We should then soon be independent of the rest of the country and Texas would be in athletics, as in so many other things, a land unto herself.

I recognize the grave evils of athletics, particularly of foot-ball. The demoralization of the student's conscience which results from the policy of "Anything to win" carries itself into his whole life. It does not seem to me fanciful to find the extraordinary financial callousness recently found to exist so generally in high places due in some measure to the dark and devious methods tolerated and even encouraged in athletics in many of our colleges and universities. No words can be too severe to use of an institution that professes to hold up the lamp of truth and righteousness, and yet stoops to lie and cheat in order to win a passing glory in a game of ball. But I believe that the evils of athletics can be controlled. Under proper supervision, with same training rules, with rigid maintenance of good standards in class work, and effective methods to secure fair play, I must insist that the end in athletic sports is most emphatically worth the means.

Next to athletics I should say that the most powerful factor in student life in the formation of character is the various societies and clubs that students maintain. The time-honored literary societies demand of their members still, as in the past, self-reliance, courage, resourcefulness, executive power. They deserve, as they receive, the fullest recognition of the authorities. Nor are the various lesser societies, literary, musical, dramatic, or what not, without their influence. Each in its own sphere calls for sus-

tained effort, usually for some commendable object, and commands approbation in so far as it does not encroach too much on its members' time. Let me single out but one among the various fields cultivated by these societies—music. That a branch of education put by the Greeks on an equal footing with letters and held by the greatest of thinkers as one of the strongest possible means of influencing character should be so nearly ignored by us is nothing short of amazing. I would that music might in its elements be taught to every student and that work in its higher forms might be offered just as in the other arts and sciences. Meantime the voluntary societies for the cultivation of music occupy a peculiarly important position. The refining and ennobling influence of music is so great that any agency which aims at its furtherance in a rational way has a claim to our sympathy and support.

More conspicuous in college life than the societies with special fields are the social clubs called fraternities and sororities. Attracting as they do a large number of students of the best families and of the largest means, they set the pace of college social life. One might almost say they make up college social life. The building of chapter houses has forced them to enlarge their membership and increase their dues in order to keep up the style of living that the elegance of the house and the ambitions of the fraternity demand. It has come about, therefore, that the original fraternity ideal of a small band of congenial men united for closer friendship and mutual improvement, in which every man was intimate with every other, has given place to that of a club, actually, if not professedly, aiming at social leadership. Everywhere the qualifications for fraternity membership are more and more coming to be social availability, with little consideration of scholarship or special attainment of any sort. The influence of fraternities on student life many believe to be hurtful. They are said to set up wrong standards, to intensify the difference between wealth and poverty, to promote class feeling, to encourage extravagance both in time and money. On the other hand, they answer to a natural tendency of human kind to seek companionship, and while their bounds of sympathy are narrow they do evoke a generous spirit of devotion of member for member and of all for the order. Frankly, if they did not exist I question whether it would be wise to create them, but to destroy them is a different matter. It is, I think, quite impracticable. Yet a certain amount of regulation seems both desirable and possible. Restrictions might

be thrown around their membership, and it might be insisted that their house-rules be conducive to rational living and good work.

Of course, what may be said in favor of controlling fraternity houses applies with almost equal force to all houses where students lodge. It seems to me that college authorities ought to satisfy themselves as to the character of every boarding house that enjoys student patronage, and wherever any considerable number of students lodge, rules should be enforced securing decent order and a sane mode of life. College students are young and inexperienced, and I can not see that it is right to leave them wholly to their own devices. Girls, especially, in my judgment, should be allowed to live only where conditions are thoroughly satisfactory.

This brings me to the question of living conditions in general. The great mass of students in every institution is hardly touched by fraternities. Many students have almost no social life at all. Just here, it seems to me, is to be found one of the great faults of our American college system. Forgetting that a man's surroundings, and still more a girl's, play an enormous part in moulding character, we take but little thought of how students live and confine our efforts to giving them good instruction in the class-room. In our smaller colleges we do not take much pains to look after the conditions of a student's life, and in the larger ones a man lives as he will, it may be well, it may be ill, and few know or care. His whole life may be barren and waste, but there is no help for it. Where numbers are great the average individual counts for little, and is lost. I have long been convinced that our big institutions ought to be broken up into small colleges and professional schools, each with its own direction, but all united into a great whole, something after the manner of an English university, but better co-ordinated and administered with less waste. The small numbers of each college would then bring it about that each man had his proper share of individual attention, and provision could then be made to secure living conditions suitable to the bringing out of the best that was in him. Where numbers are reckoned by the thousands anything of the sort seems out of the question. Yet something ought to be done. If a subdivision into small colleges is impracticable, a system of living halls, each containing from fifty to one hundred students, with dining room and common room for social intercourse, certainly is not impossible. Such halls are in actual operation in many places with admirable results. Such in effect are the fraternity houses to be found everywhere. The

carrying out of this plan will involve money, of course, but with the gifts of the past twenty years to education before our eyes, who will say that it is not to be hoped for? What a field for philanthropy! What an opportunity to perpetuate a name in association with the promotion of right standards of living both in morals and manners!

Such are some of the more prominent agencies in college life that go to the making of character. I must pass by as obvious the very greatest perhaps of all moral forces, the influence of noble lives. I have not time even to suggest others. My object in what I have said is simply to bring out the need of a more earnest study of the moral side of education. It is, after all, the side that is of most worth. It is often said that we want men that can do things, but more than that we want men that will work for the general good and not first for private gain.

Transfers and Credits.

DEAN S. L. HORNBEAK.

A careful consideration of entrance requirements is fundamental to a discussion of the subject under consideration. Before any approximate valuation of the work done in a given school can be determined, it is essential to know the extent and thoroughness of the foundation work required for admission to its freshman class. The amount and thoroughness of the work done before admission to the freshman class is not only a measure of the knowledge acquired prior to that time, but may be taken as a standard of the student's ability to master new fields of thought.

Believing that the subject of entrance requirements is basic in this discussion, and further believing that it was the purpose that this paper should initiate a discussion that might prove helpful to Texas institutions, I examined, with some care, the entrance requirements of seven of the institutions in this State doing college or undergraduate work. Six of the seven institutions compared are under denominational control and conduct fitting schools to prepare students for admission to their freshman classes; the seventh

is The University of Texas. These seven schools are in substantial agreement as to the amount and character of work required for admission to their college courses. All demand practically the same entrance requirements of three credits, or three years' work, in English; in mathematics the credits vary from three to four and one-half, including higher arithmetic; in history the requirements are from one and one-half to two credits. Most of these schools require Latin, and with possibly one exception demand three credits in this language, comprising practically the same amount of work. The schools not requiring Latin accept an equivalent amount of some other foreign language. All except one require one credit in Greek, if Greek is to be taken in the college classes. Most of the schools considered require two credits in science, one credit in physics, one credit in physiology and physiography together.

The colleges maintaining full preparatory schools require three years for the completion of their preparatory courses. The question may be asked, "Can these schools in three years' time give as thorough preparation for the freshman class as the public high schools do, many of which devote four years to the completion of their courses?" It must be remembered in this connection that high schools do not plan their courses primarily to prepare for college, but to fit young men and young women for the duties of life. Their courses are more extensive but usually less intensive than those of the college preparatory school; or, to put it differently, schools of the former class only incidentally prepare for college, while the recognized purpose of the latter is to lay deep and strong a foundation that will sustain the superstructure of a well-rounded college course.

It should be said in this connection, however, that if a high school has a strong faculty and an equipment that enables it to do well a part of the work usually done in the freshman class, the graduates of such a school, on entering college, should receive due credit for the college work completed.

In case one college does not require as much work for admission to its freshman class as another, then a student going from the former to the latter should have his credits diminished by an amount equal to the deficiency in the entrance requirements of the institution from which he comes.

Starting now from a common plane of entrance requirements, we shall consider briefly some of the elements that enter into the valu-

ation of a course of study given in one college as compared with the work done in other colleges.

Attention is first directed to the time element in a course of study. The schools under consideration in this paper have terms, counting actual work, exclusive of Christmas holidays and commencement week, varying from thirty-six to thrity-eight weeks in length. The majority of them have thirty-six weeks of actual work in the class room. Defining a course as three hours of recitation or lecture work a week for an entire session, it is noted that these schools require the completion of from twenty to twenty-one and one-third courses for graduation with the bachelor's degree. This requires an average of fifteen to sixteen hours' class work a week throughout the four years course.

The period of recitation in these schools (with one exception), including the time for assembling, is one hour in length. In the case of the exception the institution had been requiring seventy-two periods of work for graduation, but has been gradually reducing the number of periods to sixty-four, and will, I understand, beginning with next year, have recitation and lecture periods one hour in length.

If all these schools adhered strictly to their programs, allowing students to take only the prescribed work in a given year, there would be no great difficulty in making a comparison of the value of the credits in the different schools. I believe I may say, however, without doing violence to the truth, that not one of these schools adheres strictly to its program in this particular. As I understand it, not even The University of Texas, that approaches as near to sound pedagogical doctrines as its environment will permit, confines its students strictly to the number of hours prescribed for a given year. It is noted in this connection, from Bulletin of The University of Texas, No. 47, that partial admission to the University can be obtained by the fulfillment of six of the required twelve and one-half credits for admission; but the remaining six and one-half credits or courses necessary for full admission to the freshman class must be secured after admission. This means that the student who is lacking in these six and one-half credits will have to absolve them while he is doing the work of his four years undergraduate course. In other words, instead of doing five courses of three hours each a year, he must add to this the equivalent of one to one and one-half high-school courses each year.

What is true in The University of Texas is also true in the various schools under denominational control, for our pupils come to us from the same rural, village, and city schools. The condition is a common one.

I do not know that any of our Texas institutions of higher education have a law like unto the "Laws of the Medes and Persians" in dealing with such cases. I know that some of the schools under consideration allow the student of marked ability to take more than the prescribed amount of work; so that in four years' time he not only does his undergraduate work, but also removes conditions amounting to even one or more full years of preparatory work. Perhaps I have stated this rather stronger than the facts justify, for it is probable that with the exception of the requirement in foreign languages, the student has already studied the subjects and only a review is necessary to enable him to remove the conditions.

It should be stated here that many students who know how to invest their spare moments and make them yield the largest results, will do eighteen or twenty hours' work a week and rank higher in their classes than the mediocre student who is doing only fifteen hours work a week. Before a final word is said concerning this phase of the subject, attention is called to another class of irregular students that present another characteristic of the problem just discussed. Some of the city high schools, and some of the private preparatory schools of the State are doing work that justly entitles their students to a credit of one course in mathematics, one course in English, and a course in history. This leaves only seventeen or eighteen credits to be secured if advanced standing is allowed. Shall we require these students to spend four years in taking these courses, or shall we allow them to take the remaining work in three years? If they take eighteen courses in three years, while other students equally bright and faithful are taking fifteen courses, then the value of a course done by the former student is less than the value of a course done by the latter.

I cannot speak advisedly on this point as to the policy of the various Texas institutions, but I fear that many schools allow their brightest and strongest students to do themselves irreparable harm by undertaking to do too much work in a given time. I would not be understood as wishing to repress the rapid growth of any student, but I am reminded by the plant kingdom that the tree of rapid growth possesses soft wood, and that it is the sturdy oak of

slow growth that weathers the storms. I believe that the best interest of the students and institutions demand that, with rare exceptions, the student be confined to the prescribed amount of work. Extra work and conditions can be removed by attendance on one or more summer sessions of some of our institutions.

I am convinced that it is sometimes the case that members of the faculties of larger institutions conscientiously underestimate the value of the work done by colleges having small faculties. The reason for this lies in the fact that they do not fully understand the methods pursued in the smaller schools; methods that conserve the energy of the instructors and at the same time do not vitiate the sterling value of the work done. To illustrate what I mean: The members of a faculty having five or six men giving their entire time to work in chemistry and an equal number giving their entire time to instruction in physics would naturally be inclined to undervalue the work of an institution in which one man does the work in both these departments. And yet it may be true that the work done by the one man is in no sense inferior to the work done by the greater number of men. To be sure the scope of the work done in the one school is much broader than in the other and will appeal to the varied tastes of prospective and special students, but it does not follow of necessity that the work in any given course in the smaller school is of less value than a corresponding course in the larger school.

How can the courses in the small college be arranged so that one man can compass a fair scope of work in these two subjects and yet not allow the work to become superficial? I shall briefly answer this question in order to bring before us a truer valuation of the work of our Texas colleges. As a basis for the work in physics and chemistry in the small college let us suppose that one course in elementary physics is required for admission to the freshman class. Let the course be the equivalent of Carhart and Chute's *High School Physics,* accompanied by a laboratory course of at least forty exercises. In the freshman class is given each year a course in general inorganic chemistry, three hours in the class room and three hours in the laboratory. Let the teacher offer for sophomore and junior pupils, one year, a course in general physics, using such a text as Carhart's *Universal Physics,* accompanied by a laboratory course of corresponding grade; the next year, let him offer a course in organic and theoretical chemistry, and for fourth-year students, or other stu-

dents prepared for the work, allow him to offer a one-half course in qualitative and a one-half course in quantitative analysis.

To give such a course as is outlined would require only six recitations or lecture periods a week, with an occasional lecture or quiz on the courses in analytical chemistry. Even if the teacher giving such a course should have to give the course in preparatory physics, he would be required to do not exceeding twelve hours' work a week in the class room. Assisted in the laboratories by advanced students, he can do the work well, and the credits received will be worth their face value. To be sure, to do this work well, a man must be thoroughly prepared, to begin with, and he will have to sacrifice, to a large extent, the pleasure and privilege of doing research work. But the fact pertinent to this paper is it can be done. A grouping similar to the foregoing can be successfully effected in some other departments of a college course, and thus the energies of the members of the faculty invested so as to yield the largest possible returns. It should be remembered that in the small colleges the sophomore and junior classes combined do not make a class too large to do effective work.

That it is desirable for a perfect understanding to exist among our leading Texas institutions concerning this subject cannot be doubted. That it is often convenient and perhaps desirable from the student's viewpoint to go from one school to another is a fact. And it is certainly just that the student in passing from one institution to another of like rank should receive full credit for all work meritoriously performed.

May I, before closing, be permitted to say that, in my humble judgment, the best interest of all our leading institutions under denominational control, the best interests of The University of Texas, and especially the best interests of the cause of education in the State, would be subserved by a very cordial agreement along certain lines? I submit as a proposition for consideration that it would be well in connection with this discussion to consider the feasibility of an agreement among our institutions of higher grade in Texas, whereby a student having completed one, two, or three years' work in one institution may enter any other institution in the group, receiving full credit for work done. I believe that such an arrangement would result in many students from the other institutions spending their senior year in The University of Texas, where they can have greater freedom in the selection of courses in

line with their chosen professions. On the other hand, I think that some of the younger students who now enter the freshman class of the University would enter the freshman class of some of the other institutions, for there are parents in Texas who believe it better for their sons and daughters, while young, to spend one or more years in a smaller school, where the individual student counts for more; and who also desire earnestly that their children should have the prestige of graduation from their State institution, the pride of all Texas. I believe that such an agreement would result also in many graduates from the other institutions in the group spending one or more years in this great institution, pursuing graduate courses. Scores of graduate students go from the various institutions of Texas each year to the University of Chicago, Princeton, Harvard, Yale, and Columbia. Could not much of the work that these graduate students do be done in own own State University at much less expense? In concluding allow me to express the hope that this paper may provoke a discussion that will be conducive in some small degree to educational progress in the great State of Texas.

Can Colleges Enforce the Requirement That Each Student Shall Do a Full Day's Work Each Day?

PROFESSOR H. Y. BENEDICT.

Any discussion or enforcement of the requirement that a student shall do a full day's work each day is rendered exceedingly difficult by the varying ability of different students in the same subject and of the same student in different subjects. The impossibility of distinguishing the moral value of the effort from the practical achievement increases the difficulty, and the college administrator must needs fall back upon the law of averages, using his best judgment now and then in dealing with exceptional cases.

Let us abbreviate this discussion, then, by admitting that there is a time to work and a time to play, and that we are to deal here only with the time to work. Let us also assume that, on the average, the proper time to work is eight hours a day, agreeable to the practice of the labor unions and to the theory of American colleges, which

with remarkable unanimity, demand sixteen hours of class-room work a week, accompanied by thirty-two hours of preparation. Let us assume further that it is very harmful for one who can accomplish the set amount of work in a certain time to take a longer time in which to do it. Such loitering while at work affects injuriously the mental and moral fiber, and in the end is prejudicial to results and to success. But this is an evil that the college or any external influence can scarcely control, and its prevention or cure depends almost wholly on the individual concerned.

The individual departures from this average of eight hours of work a day are of course large. Many college students—let us not venture a guess at the percentage—work a good deal more than this, but apparently a larger number devote less than this time to their studies. A considerable number of the best students are unable to keep a simultaneous interest in four or five subjects, and hence vary in performance under different instructors even when pretty constant in the total amount of work performed each week. But the good or even the moderately good student need not concern us much here, where we are to deal mainly with the delinquent student and with the possibility of raising the minimum of effort to eight hours of honest toil a day. Undoubtedly many youths go through college and in some mysterious way get a good deal of benefit out of it with very little effort. Despite the eloquent and in many ways valid pleas for the benefits to be derived from leisurely contact with the best that has been said and done and thought in the world (pardon the plagiarism!), nevertheless the world is a working one, and the habit of industry, of earnest effort, is one that should be strengthened, not weakened, by four years of college life. It is precisely the earnest effort that collegians put into sport that makes athletics of value in college life. If the average of effort in study could be raised, the benefits to be derived from a college career would become much more manifest than they are at present, manifest though they are. Let us proceed in detail to the means and the difficulty of raising the average of effort.

In one sense a university is a manufacturing plant in which the instructors are the foremen of gangs of workmen. Hence, in many ways, the methods of business can be applied with profit to college work. A few examples where business system is applicable will suggest others.

1. Regular attendance at class can be secured by limiting the

number of allowable absences a subject each term. If the allowable number be exceeded, no credit for the course should be given. To cover certain special cases the limit should be removable by special action of a central officer acting agreeably to his own judgment and to that of the instructor concerned.

2. Frequent written or other tests by the instructor of each class so that each student gets at least two grades a week in a class that meets thrice. The written test is the only way of reaching large classes effectively, for it falls, like the rain, on the just and the unjust.

3. Weekly reports, promptly sent in by each instructor to the central office, dealing only with defective students and promptly acted upon by the central office, said action to result in probation or dismissal, a time limit being placed upon the period of probation.

4. Systematic report of the grades of defective students promptly reported to the parent or guardian.

All of the above methods are objective, and can be carried out as mechanical routine. In my opinion, a reasonable percentage of students should be sent home each term, both for their sake and for the sake of those that remain. It is quite astonishing how a few dismissals for neglect of work tend to tone up the general work. It is a fortunate circumstance when one so relegated to the parental care is prominent socially or otherwise. Further, I think the college should occasionally dismiss a student who is making his courses, on the general ground of being a nuisance.

While the above methods deal fairly effectively with the obviously delinquent student, they fail to reach the large and very important class which is making its courses but which could do better if properly urged. Students belonging to this group could hardly be sent home; to do so would be unfair and would almost depopulate any college. They can be reached only by appeals to their pride or to that of their parents. They are almost beyond the reach of drill master, and form the material from which the teacher who is an inspiration creates his own movement. The only way in which college routine could deal with such students is by letters to parents telling them that the son or daughter has more ability than industry. The compliment would be appreciated, and results would probably follow.

Difficulties arise in regarding a college as a manufacturing plant when we attempt to estimate quantitatively the article produced,

which is of the spirit and not to be measured in terms of any known unit. We cannot accurately determine the achievement of a student, and still less can we determine the effort required to produce the achievement. Morally we should demand eight hours of honest effort; practically, and, viewed from an evolutionary standpoint, rightly, we should demand eight hours of actual achievement. To distinguish between effort and achievement requires the most intimate acquaintance between pupil and instructor, an acquaintance possible only with small classes and under the most favorable social conditions. Under the most favorable circumstances the judgment of effort will be rude, and upon achievement will the merit of a particular individual be based. Such is the way of the cruel world, such the result of grading examination papers. To acquire merit and to succeed are two different things, and perhaps it is well that it is so.

Making each course demand about the same amount of work from the average student is another important factor in getting a full day's work out of each student. Difficult as the equating of work in different courses under different instructors may be, I think it possible to improve on present conditions. The central officers, by hypothesis, of sane judgment and close observers, can tell pretty well from the drift of students from one course to another how the courses compare in difficulty; the line of least resistance is a fairly well blazed trail. The snap courses and the unduly difficult ones can be located, and in most cases a gentle hint will lead the instructor concerned, generally willing to profit by well-meant advice, to bring his course nearer to the general level. If hints are not effective, then arises a case for judicious executive interference.

Students too generally regard themselves, while in college, as working for a master rather than for themselves. This view, obviously erroneous, should be discouraged by the instructor, who should, as far as humanly possible, make the student feel that he is grappling with the difficulties of the subject itself and for his own benefit, and not because of any caprice on the part of the instructor.

Moreover, students often fail to discern any benefit to be derived from studies, the benefits being in many cases obscure and remote in time. It seems to me that an instructor should now and then tell his pupils frankly what good they may expect of the particular topic that he is giving them. Frankly coming into contact

with the point of view of the student, correcting it where necessary, and commending it when possible, is a part of the duty of the instructor, applicable to the things of his own topic and to matters of even wider range.

Parents and the public generally expect far too much of schools in the way of moral education. It is unreasonable to expect the college, which must deal largely with boys in the mass and which exists mainly for the benefit of those who have the desire to profit by the opportunities to have as minute a knowledge of the boy's character as the parent and to inculcate habits of industry and self-control in four years which the boy has not acquired in the previous sixteen. It is mainly the parents who should incline the twig the way the tree should grow; the school should help, but it is only one and not the chief factor. The college has the right to say, "Do your tasks or get out;" the parent has a harder duty to perform.

In closing, let me express the opinion that all methods which seek to control the daily life of the student outside of class are liable to create evils perhaps more serious than they are intended to destroy. For boys rules are especially made to be broken, and in dealing with them it is well to present to them in not too obvious ways the opinions of respectable society and to deal with infractions of the code after they occur in a prompt and vigorous manner. Students nearly always know as well as their instructors what is right and what is wrong, and resent being told too much. It may be laid down as a rule that rules make sneaks, from which heaven deliver us. The duty of a college is not to see that rules are enforced, but to create and cherish such an atmosphere, such a spirit, on the part of all its members, that the mind is fixed more on doing noble things than on not doing ignoble ones, more on the significant and large phases of life than on the gossipy and trivial. Living in such an atmosphere in constant contact with large views, the student will learn to place himself, to see his nation and his time in due perspective, to master his own powers, and to reach "self-knowledge, self-reverence, self-control."

MEETING OF SUPERINTENDENTS AND PRINCIPALS OF AFFILIATED SCHOOLS.

SUPERINTENDENT CARL HARTMAN.

The meeting of the County Superintendents' Association of Texas in the Athenæum Hall of The University of Texas on April 18 and 19 was an occasion of great interest and aroused much enthusiasm in the educational circles of Texas. It was the first regular meeting of the new organization, and the successful launching of the organization under the inspiration of The University of Texas portends well for its success in the future.

Throughout the meeting Superintendent Carl Hartman of Travis County presided, and Superintendent S. C. Wilson of Walker County acted as secretary. President David F. Houston of the State University welcomed the association to Austin and the University, and in the course of his address emphasized the unity of the school system of the State and paid a high tribute to the teachers and officers of the country schools of Texas. Superintendent Charles L. Block of Hill County responded to the address of welcome, expressing the thanks and appreciation of the cordial greeting and welcome from the University.

After the preliminaries the subjects of the program were taken up in regular order and discussed. Each subject proved to be full of interest and the solution of the problems involved of such importance to the various county superintendents that justice could be done to few of the subjects in the alloted time. Indeed, some of the subjects were, by request, continued to the December meeting. Yet some definite results were attained, as is seen from the resolutions reported by the committee appointed at the beginning of the meeting and whose duty it was to reduce to definite form the conclusions arrived at on the floor of the house.

The first subject, "What Should Be the Main Purpose of the Association of County Superintendents," was discussed interestingly and profitably by Hon. F. M. Bralley of Austin, Superintendent M. L. Moody of Jefferson County, and others. The purposes of the

Association as agreed upon and as adopted in the Constitution are as follows:

"1. To so work together in the study of school conditions and possibilities in Texas, that, by concerted action on the part of the members of the Association, the efficiency of the public school system may be increased.

"2. To more perfectly determine the duties and responsibilities of the County Superintendents of the State, and to arrive at conclusions as to the most efficient methods of school supervision.

"3. To co-operate with the State Teachers' Association and other educational forces of the State in all matters that look to the improvement of the county schools."

The "County Institute Work in Texas" was the second subject to engross the attention of the superintendents. Superintendent P. P. Stewart of Bexar County and Superintendent C. A. Wheeler of Bowie County lead in the discussion, and were followed by many others, thus giving the Association the benefit of experiences in institute work from all sections of the State. The discussion of this subject led to the unanimous adoption of the following resolutions:

"1. This Association heartily and unqualifiedly endorses the law enacted by the Twenty-ninth Legislature, making more definite the duties and responsibilites of the superintendents and *ex-officio* superintendents concerning the county teachers' institutes and in requiring the attendance of the teachers at the said institutes.

"2. It is the opinion of the Association that one institute of five or six consecutive days, supplemented by local institutes of one day each, is more helpful, satisfactory, and comes nearer to accomplishing the true purpose of the county institute than three or more institutes of two days each.

"3. The institutes in order to accomplish the best results should be held as early as practicable in the scholastic year.

"4. This Association believes that the responsibility for the institute work of the county is placed by law upon the county superintendent, and that the efficiency of the said institutes indicates in a large measure the efficiency of the county superintendent."

"The Scope and Nature of the Work of the County Superintendent is Visiting the County Schools" was ably discussed by Superintendent B. F. Whiteside of Shelby County, Superintendent L. L. Pugh of Harris County, and others, many important points being

brought out and emphasized. The following is the declaration of the Association on this subject:

"We believe that the official visits of the county superintendent to the schools of his county may be made in such way and at such a time as to be of great value in awakening and stimulating school interest among pupils, patrons, and teachers, and we further believe that the county superintendent or ex-officio superintendent who neglects this work has failed in the discharge of the most important duty of his office."

The "Transfer Laws" and other phases of the school laws were discussed with great profit.

In the forenoon of April 19th the Association attended the inaugural ceremonies of the President of The University of Texas.

In the afternoon the following distinguished educators addressed the Association, to its delight and edification: Professor H. C. Pritchett, of Huntsville; Superintendent S. M. N. Marrs, of Terrell; Dr. W. S. Sutton, of The University of Texas; Dr. George R. MacLean, President of the University of Iowa; Dr. James H. Kirkland, Chancellor of Vanderbilt University; State Superintendent R. B. Cousins. All of these addresses were inspiring and instructive.

State Superintendent R. B. Cousins and F. M. Bralley, Chief Clerk of the State Department of Education, were elected to membership in the Association. Resolutions were passed thanking the officers and the Faculty of The University of Texas for all courtesies extended.

The following were elected as the officers of the Association for the next year:

Superintendent F. P. Guenther, of Lavaca County, President.

Superintendent P. F. Stewart, of Bexar County, First Vice President.

Superintendent J. T. Brooks, of Ellis County, Second Vice President.

Superintendent Charles L. Block, of Hill County, Secretary-Treasurer.

Superintendent W. G. Gillis, of Milam County, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer.

The Association then voted to hold its next regular meeting at Fort Worth in December, 1901.

This closed the first regular meeting of the Association of County Superintendents of Texas, which bids fair to develop into one of the

STATE PRINTING CO., HOUSTON